

MANUSCRIPTS IN THE SCHØYEN COLLECTION



BUDDHIST MANUSCRIPTS

Volume III

General Editor:
Jens Braarvig

Editorial Committee:
Jens Braarvig, Paul Harrison, Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Kazunobu Matsuda, Lore Sander

HERMES PUBLISHING · OSLO

2006

*Hermes Academic Publishing & Bookshop A/S,
P.O.Box 2709 Solli, N-0204 Oslo*

© Jens Braarvig 2006

*All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,
without the prior permission in writing of Hermes Academic Publishing & Bookshop.
Exceptions are allowed in respect of any fair dealing for the purpose
of research or private study, or criticism or review.
Enquiries concerning reproduction outside these terms should
be sent to the publisher with the address as stated above.*

ISBN 82 8034 006 8

*Printed in Norway
by
RK Grafisk AS Oslo*

CONVENTIONS

Description of a fragment:

recto and verso, abbreviated r and v, if a fragment is identified

A and B, if the beginning cannot be decided

a, b, c, d, etc., for several fragments of one number, e. g., 2378/1/17a, in the uf (unlocalized fragments) sections, e. g. 2378/uf2/1a

Symbols:

() restorations in a gap

[] damaged akṣara(s)

< > omission of (part of) an akṣara without gap in the ms.

<< >> interlinear insertion

{ } superfluous (part of an) akṣara

+ one destroyed akṣara

~<number>+ approximate number of lost akṣaras, e. g. ~60+

.. one illegible akṣara

. illegible part of an akṣara

... indefinite number of lost akṣaras

/// beginning or end of a fragment when broken

* virāma

' avagraha, not added in transliteration, but added without brackets in reconstruction (note, however, 'pi and pi)

ḥ upadhmāṇīya

ḥ jīhvāmūlīya

⊗ double circle with rosette

○ string hole

Punctuation:

ms.	ed.	rec.
gap for punctuation	◇	or
᳚	· or	
᳚	·	or
᳚᳚	:	
5	5	5 (verse number)

Tibetan transliteration: ṅ, ñ, ź, ś, g-yog

Chinese transcription: Pinyin without tonal diacritics

Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā*

Paul Harrison and Shōgo Watanabe

I. Bibliographical Survey and Description of the Manuscript

1. Sanskrit Texts of the Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā

The *Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā* (Vaj) is one of the most celebrated and historically significant works of the voluminous *Prajñāpāramitā* (“Perfection of Wisdom” or “Perfection of Insight”) corpus. To date its Sanskrit text has been accessible to the scholarly world in the form of nine published editions, either of the complete work or substantial parts of it. These nine are listed below in chronological order of appearance, with the sigla by which they are referred to in this study, followed by brief notes on each of them.

1. F. Max Müller, ed., “Vagrakkhedikā [= Vajracchedikā],” in *Buddhist Texts From Japan* (Anecdota Oxoniensia, Aryan Series Vol.1, Part 1), Oxford, 1881, pp. 15–46.
Referred to as **M** in this study.
2. E. F. Pargiter, ed., “Vajracchedikā in the Original Sanskrit, Stein MS., No. D.III.13b,” in *Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature Found in Eastern Turkestan*, ed. by A. F. Rudolf Hoernle, Oxford, 1916, pp. 176–195.
Referred to as **P** in this study.
3. N. P. Chakravarti, ed., “The Gilgit Text of the *Vajracchedikā*,” in *Minor Buddhist Texts* (SOR IX.1), ed. by G. Tucci, Rome, 1956, pp. 173–192.
4. E. Conze, ed., *Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā, Edited and Translated with Introduction and Glossary* (SOR XIII), Rome, 1957. 2nd edition, with Corrections and Additions, Rome, 1974.
Referred to as **Cz** in this study.
5. N. Dutt, ed., *Gilgit Manuscripts*, Vol. VI, Calcutta, 1959. Reprint: Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica 24, Delhi, 1984, pp. 139–170.
6. P. L. Vaidya, ed., “Vajracchedikā nāma Triśatikā Prajñāpāramitā,” in *Mahāyāna-sūtra-saṃgraha*, Part 1 (BST 17), Darbhanga, 1961, pp. 75–89.
7. L. M. Joshi, *Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitāsūtra with the Commentary of Asaṃga, Critically edited and translated into Hindi with Introduction, Notes and Glossary* (Bibliotheca Indo-Tibetica 3), Varanasi, 1978.
8. G. Schopen, “The Manuscript of the *Vajracchedikā* Found at Gilgit,” in *Studies in the Literature of the Great Vehicle: Three Mahāyāna Buddhist Texts*, ed. by L. O. Gómez and J. Silk, Ann Arbor, 1989, pp. 89–139.
Referred to as **G** in this study.

* The first announcement that the Schøyen Collection contained a manuscript of the *Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā* was made by the BMSC Project Group at the 12th Congress of the International Association of Buddhist Studies held in Lausanne in 1999. Through the good offices of Kazunobu Matsuda, and with the consent of editor-in-chief Jens Braarvig and other members of the Project Group, Shōgo Watanabe undertook the initial transliteration, reconstruction and analysis of the manuscript, in which endeavour he was subsequently joined by Paul Harrison, with whom the work was brought to completion. In the course of their researches both authors have benefitted from the advice of Akira Yuyama, Seishi Karashima and Rolf Giebel, and take this opportunity to express their gratitude to these scholars.

9. Rushi foxue yanjiushi 如實佛學研究室, ed. *Jingang boruo boluomi jing* 金剛般若波羅蜜經, 5 vols., Taipei, 1995–1996. The edition of the Sanskrit text occupies Vol. 3, pp. 1–64.

The Sanskrit text of the Vaj has been translated into modern languages many times. Among the English translations, those by F. Max Müller, Edward Conze and Gregory Schopen have been particularly influential, especially that of Conze. For bibliographical details, readers may consult the introduction to Paul Harrison, “Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā: A New English Translation of the Sanskrit Text Based on Two Manuscripts from Greater Gandhāra,” which appears later in this volume (hereafter referred to as ET).¹

Both for editions and for translations of the Vaj the *editio princeps* published by F. Max Müller in 1881 (referred to in our study as M) has been of decisive importance, not least because of the way in which it divides the text into sections.² Müller used four witnesses to establish his text: two handwritten copies of an old manuscript preserved in the Kōkiji 高貴寺 temple in Osaka, Japan, and two blockprints from China. Since the two manuscripts from Japan are copies deriving ultimately from the same original, they can be regarded as a single witness. That original is apparently a Sanskrit text of the Vaj discovered after the death of the eminent priest Jiun Onkō 慈雲飲光 (1718–1804) by his disciple Chidō 智幢 (1776–1854). This text was reproduced in fascicle 320 of the *Bongaku shinryō* 梵學津梁, compiled by Jiun and his disciples. In this compendium it appears that the Sanskrit text was written vertically, with Chinese equivalents for the Sanskrit words in the column to the right and a Chinese phonetic transcription to the left, followed by the Chinese translations of Kumārajīva and Dharmagupta in the next two columns. One of the copies acquired by Müller, made by the priest Kanematsu Kuken 金松空賢 in September 1880, contained all of this material,³ while the second, made by the priest Kurehito Kaishin 久日人戒心 of Kōkiji (presumably around the same time), contained only the Sanskrit text, written horizontally.⁴ Together they constitute what Müller refers to in his apparatus as J. As for the two woodblock prints from China, one is a woodblock edition printed in Beijing in 1760, probably at the Songzhusi 嵩祝寺. In this print, the Sanskrit text appears both in Lañtsha script and in Tibetan transliteration, to which has been added a Tibetan translation made at the Chos 'khor rab rgyas gliñ temple⁵ in Beijing by

¹ Fuller bibliographical surveys may be found in Conze 1978: 60–66 and Yuyama 1967: 61–83, 112–114, 122–124.

² These divisions are based on those imposed on the text of Kumārajīva's translation, which are alleged to have been the work of Prince Chaoming 昭明太子 of Liang 梁 some time in the 6th century (see Müller 1881: 18). It is better to call them sections or even paragraphs (as Müller himself does) rather than chapters. Most subsequent editions, translations and studies of the Vaj have followed them, as do we (marking them with §).

³ Cat. Bodl. Japan. No. 54. One page reproduced in Müller 1881, Plate 1. We assume that this copy is a faithful reflection of the original *Bongaku shinryō*, although this has not been verified. Müller (1881: 16) records receiving it on 15 February 1881. It is not clear how this relates to the copy of the Vaj which he records receiving as part of a consignment of books brought to England from Japan by Alexander Wylie (Müller 1881: 2), unless this is a reference to Ch (see below). We note in this regard that Müller's introductory notes are sometimes quite confusing.

⁴ Cat. Bodl. Japan. No. 55. One page reproduced in Müller 1881, Plate 2. This copy was sent to Müller at Oxford University by Ernest (later Sir Ernest) Satow, Secretary of the English Legation in Edo (Tokyo). At this point we cannot say whether it simply extracts the Sanskrit text from the previous item, or whether it reproduces another copy of the Vaj held at Kōjiki. Several are known to exist, but their relationship to each other has yet to be determined. Nor is it clear whether the original ms discovered by Chidō still exists, or what it was, an Indian palm-leaf or a later Japanese copy of one. The *Bongaku shinryō* as a whole underwent a process of continual revision, and a number of different tables of contents for it also survive. The situation is complicated, and only a thorough investigation of the holdings of the Kōjiki library will clarify it.

⁵ The identity of this establishment is not clear. According to Wang Yao, this may be a reference to the temple known in Chinese as the Xinjiaosi, which was located by the Gaoliang River outside Beijing's Xizhi Gate (Wang Bangwei,

the *lha bris* (painter) Dam pa, working under the auspices of lCañ skya II Rol pa'i rdo rje (1717–86), state preceptor during the reign of the Qing emperor Qianlong (this is M's T).⁶ The other woodblock print of the Vaj was included in a book of Sanskrit texts acquired by the British collector Alexander Wylie in Beijing, in which the Sanskrit text was engraved in the Lañtsha script and printed in red ink (this is M's Ch).⁷ Müller's edition, then, was based on four (or three, if the two copies of J are counted as one) witnesses either hand-copied or printed in comparatively recent times, and thus they may be assumed to postdate the oldest Sanskrit manuscripts of the Vaj by about one thousand years.

No such manuscripts were known, however, when Müller produced his edition. The first to come to light was the Central Asian ms discovered by Sir Aurel Stein in the remains of a dwelling at Dandān Uiliq in Eastern Turkestan in December 1900, and identified by A. F. Rudolf Hoernle in 1903 as a copy of the Vaj.⁸ It was not until 1916 that F. E. Pargiter published a full edition of this ms (No. 2 in the list above, henceforth referred to as P), originally complete in 19 folios, of which five had been lost, with many others in a poor state of preservation. According to Pargiter, it dates from the end of the fifth century or the beginning of the sixth century, and represents a text which, at least in terms of content, is fairly close to the Chinese translation by Kumārajīva (401 C.E.).

The second ancient ms of the Vaj to appear was found among the 15 or so Mahāyāna sūtras, some of them in multiple copies, which were discovered along with a large number of other Buddhist texts in the remains of a tower-like building near Naupur, three miles north of Gilgit, in Pakistan, in 1931 (see Jettmar 1981 and especially Fussman 2004, which offers a new perspective on the function of this building and its library, and presents a revised list of titles). Most of these manuscripts are now preserved in the National Archives of India in New Delhi. They include seven folios of the Vaj, dating to the 6th or 7th century, which were eventually published in facsimile edition by Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra in 1974.⁹ Well before then, however, in 1956, these folios had been published in romanized form by N. P. Chakravarti in the *Serie Orientale Roma* inaugurated by G. Tucci (No. 3 in our list above). Three years later (in 1959) N. Dutt brought out a version in the Nāgarī script based on Chakravarti's edition (No. 5 in our list). Dutt supplied passages missing in the Gilgit manuscript from Müller's edition and published his edition as a complete version. These additions are pointed out in the notes, but they contain many mistakes. Three decades later (1989), Gregory Schopen provided a detailed and searching review of the editions of Chakravarti and Dutt in the light of a meticulous rereading of the Gilgit manuscript (No. 7 in our list). Presenting a new transliteration of the ms, he also added detailed notes and an English translation. Since Schopen's diplomatic edition of the ms is done with a degree of accuracy and fidelity sadly lacking in those of his predecessors, it is the only one utilized in this study, referred to by the siglum G.¹⁰

personal communication). However, consultation of Heissig 1954 and von Franz 1984 has produced no further illumination.

⁶ The recto of folio 3 is reproduced in Müller 1881, Plate 3. For further details, including the text of the colophon, see Yuyama 1967: 61–65. The Tibetan translation, being an 18th-century work, differs from the version found in the Kanjur.

⁷ The page carrying the start of the text is reproduced in Müller 1881, Plate 4. The date of printing is not known to us, although the printers appear to have been the Beijing firm Tianqinghao 天清號 (see Yuyama 1967: 66, 105), whose premises were at the Songzhusi (see Heissig 1954: 5).

⁸ See Stein: 1907: I, 256–258 for an account of the discovery, and p. 295 for a brief note by Hoernle on the ms.

⁹ See Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra 1974: Part 7, ff. 1380–1393.

¹⁰ Schopen's edition has been checked against a microfilm of the original ms, and has been found entirely reliable,

Several new editions of the complete Sanskrit text of the Vaj were brought out after the publication of the Central Asian and Gilgit fragments, but none of them represents a significant advance on M. Nevertheless, Edward Conze's 1957 edition (No. 4, Cz) has, as it were, assumed canonical status, despite its shortcomings.¹¹ Conze used Müller's edition as his base text, checking its readings against another copy of the bilingual Tibetan blockprint (Müller's T) kept in the library of the School of Oriental and African Studies, London. He presented the text in Roman script, with various orthographical modifications, Western punctuation, liberal use of hyphens to break up compounds, and the sandhi between vowels resolved.¹² In the footnotes he added the results of comparisons with P (No. 2), Chakravarti's edition of the Gilgit manuscript (No. 3), the commentaries by Asaṅga and Vasubandhu, and the Tibetan translation, as well as the Chinese translation by Kumārajīva. When there is a phrase that is missing in P and/or G, it is set within parentheses in the text. However, Conze did not use M consistently as his base text, occasionally making changes to the wording in which he conflated his various witnesses arbitrarily. He also failed to list the differences between his witnesses exhaustively. Some of the failings of the resulting text have been pointed out by Schopen (1989: 96–97). Nevertheless, most subsequent translations and studies have relied on Conze's edition, and philosophical questions have also been addressed on the less than solid foundation it provides. Herein lies a major problem.

In 1961 P. L. Vaidya included an edition of the Vaj in Volume 1 of the *Mahāyāna-sūtra-saṃgraha* in the Buddhist Sanskrit Texts Series (No. 6). Using M as a basis, he made a number of changes to the text, but without any annotation (M's original footnotes were also dispensed with). Vaidya's "improvements" are therefore silent, and they are not always improvements. Although he notes variants in the Gilgit Manuscript, his notes are neither exhaustive nor accurate, being based on Chakravarti and/or Dutt,¹³ whose readings of the ms are highly unreliable, as Schopen has amply demonstrated. Since Vaidya did not consult any new mss himself, his "edition" can safely be set aside, unlike Conze's, which for all its imperfections cannot be ignored. For similar reasons one can also set aside Joshi's 1978 edition, which appears to draw on the work of its predecessors (Müller, Pargiter, Chakravarti, Conze and Vaidya) without, as far as we know, reviewing any of the manuscript evidence afresh, while adding or reproducing numerous errors in sandhi and typographical mistakes. In the same way the synoptic Taiwanese edition (No. 9) simply reproduces Müller's edition in roman script, with the sections divided into smaller subsections. However, it also provides students of the text with a remarkably comprehensive set of resources, and is therefore a valuable contribution to the study of the Vaj.¹⁴

even though a few minor improvements can be suggested, for which see ET, Introduction. His text has also been reproduced as Chap. XXI of Oguibénine 1996 (pp. 252–265), accompanied by useful notes.

¹¹ It was reprinted in a second edition in 1974, unchanged save for the addition of an appendix entitled "Corrections and Added Notes," pp. 115–118.

¹² Conze also adopted M's division of the text into sections, dividing some of them still further into subsections.

¹³ It is in fact not entirely clear which scholar's work Vaidya drew upon for his knowledge of the Gilgit ms, since on p. viii of his introduction he states "I have added a few variants found in the fragments of the Gilgit Mss. recently edited by Dr. N. Dutt and published by Dr. G. Tucci, in his *Minor Buddhist Texts*, part I, Rome, 1957 [sic]."

¹⁴ This massive 5-volume compendium contains not only the Sanskrit text, but a modern Chinese translation with extensive annotations, the Sanskrit text with detailed vocabulary and grammatical notes (in Chinese), seven Chinese translations, the Tibetan translation (Derge edition), seven Japanese translations (Nanjio 1909; Ama 1933; Watanabe 1956–1957; Ui 1958; Nagao (a) 1973; Nakamura 1993 [1960]; Nagao (b) 1993 [1978]), the two English translations of Müller and Conze, the French translation of Harlez (1891), and the German translation of Walleiser (1914). Since all these different versions are reprinted with identical division into sections and subsections, the comparison of their readings is greatly facilitated.

In addition to the publications reviewed above, which contain editions of the complete text or of substantial portions of it, and are in most cases well known, small sections of the Vaj are also preserved in the following Central Asian fragments, either published or unpublished:¹⁵

- Frag a. Cat. No. 1195 in Lore Sander and Ernst Waldschmidt, eds., *Sanskrihandschriften aus den Turfanfunden*, Teil V, Wiesbaden, 1985, pp. 188–189 (see also Plate 81). The left side of a single folio bearing text from §§5–6, written in Gilgit/Bamiyan Type II, alphabet m (Sander 1968).
- Frag b. K. Matsuda, ed., *Sanskrit Fragments of the Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra: A Study of the Central Asian Documents in the Stein/Hoernle Collection of the India Office Library, London (Studia Tibetica No. 14)*, Tokyo, 1988, pp. 76–77. This is a small fragment, measuring 8cm x 12cm, from the middle of a single folio in the Hoernle Collection, now in the possession of the British Library. It was published by Matsuda Kazunobu in his 1988 study of the Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra as one of a number of unidentified fragments in the Hoernle and Stein collections, under the reference number A-17. The identification of this as part of the Vaj was first published by Hiromi Habata, in her article “Daijō Nehangyō no mihitei no bonbun danpen ni tsuite,” *Indo tetsugaku bukkyōgaku*, Vol. 8 (1993), pp. 129–144 (see esp. p. 130, n. 8).¹⁶ According to Matsuda, the ms fragment in question is almost certainly from Khadalik. The script is Early Turkestan Brāhmī Type b, alphabet s, according to Sander (1968: Tables 29–40; 1986: 167), dating roughly from the 5–6th centuries. The fragment bears text from §§15a–16b.
- Frag c. G. M. Bongard-Levin and M. I. Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, eds., *Vajracchedikā prajñāpāramitā (Bibliotheca Buddhica 34)*, Moscow, 1990, pp. 260–263, 425. This ms (SI P/81) is a fragment of only one folio (6cm x 23.5cm) bearing six lines per side, preserved at the Russian Academy of Sciences. The script is Turkestan Gupta Type (alphabet q), thus roughly 5th century. It corresponds to part of §17.
- Frag d. Cat. No. 1910 in Heinz Bechert, ed., *Sanskrihandschriften aus den Turfanfunden*, Teil VIII, Wiesbaden, 2000, pp. 93–94. A fragment from the right end of a single folio bearing text from §§6–8. The script is North Turkestan Brāhmī Type b, alphabet u (Sander 1968).
- Frag e. Cat. No. 1939+4194a in Heinz Bechert, ed., *Sanskrihandschriften aus den Turfanfunden*, Teil VIII, Wiesbaden, 2000, pp. 117–118. Two fragments from the left and middle portions of a single folio (with the number 308), bearing text from §§11–12. The script is North Turkestan Brāhmī Type b, alphabet u (Sander 1968).
- Frag f. Unpublished: Hoernle Collection no. 143 S.A.19, in the possession of the British Library. A single folio, well preserved, bearing text from §§15a–c. Identified by Jens-Uwe Hartmann. For a preliminary transliteration we are indebted to Jens-Uwe Hartmann and Klaus Wille.
- Frag g. Unpublished: Hoernle Collection no. 149/146 + unnumbered fragm., in the possession of the British Library.¹⁷ Two fragments from the middle portion of a single folio, bearing

¹⁵ This list is not necessarily complete, but merely records all those ms fragments of the Vaj which have come to our attention (in most cases thanks to the prompting of Jens-Uwe Hartmann).

¹⁶ Kazunobu Matsuda informs us that this identification had already been made independently by Gregory Schopen, and that he had transmitted this to Habata.

¹⁷ Cf. Hartmann & Wille 1992: 26, 35.

text from §§30b–32b. Identified by Jens-Uwe Hartmann and Klaus Wille, who also kindly supplied us with a preliminary transliteration.

- Frag h. Unpublished: Stein Collection no. Kha. i. 26 (= Or. 8212.18), in the possession of the British Library. Four fragments of a ms recovered from Khadalik, the largest bearing text from §§25–26a. Identification and description published in Aurel Stein, *Serindia*, Vol. III, Oxford, 1921, p. 1433.
- Frag i. Unpublished: Stein Collection no. Kha. i. 39 (= Or. 8212.20), in the possession of the British Library. One fragment of a ms recovered from Khadalik, bearing text from §§25–30. Identification and description published in Aurel Stein, *Serindia*, Vol. III, Oxford, 1921, p. 1434.¹⁸
- Frag j. No. 77 in Klaus Wille, “Some recently identified Sanskrit fragments from the Stein and Hoernle collections in the British Library, London (1),” *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology*, VIII (2005), pp. 47–80 (see pp. 70–71). Hoernle Collection no. 150.vii.32. One fragment from a single folio, bearing text from §§17b–e. The script is Southern Turkestan Brāhmī (main type).
- Frag k. No. IV in Ariyoshi Sanada, “Otani Tankentai Shōrai Bonbun Bitten Shiryō,” *Saiiki Bunka Kenkyū* (Monumenta Serindica), Vol. 4, Kyōto, 1961, pp. 73–76. A single folio broken in two, with some loss of material in the middle, corresponding to the first half of §6, written in Southern Turkestan Brāhmī, late 5th or early 6th century. We are grateful to Akira Yuyama for providing us with copies of Sanada's work, which unfortunately came to hand too late for the readings of this fragment to be incorporated in our edition.

Besides these Central Asian fragments of the text, Sanskrit mss of the Vaj are also known to exist in Nepal. Yuyama (1967: 68) records three, one in the Bir Library in Kathmandu (No. 276 (*te* 722/1)) and two in the Hem Raj Collection (No. 29 (-3) and No. 30 (-9)). While the latter pair have yet to be traced in the Nepalese National Archives, into which these older collections have been absorbed, the former item, now National Archives 3–722, is in fact an incomplete *gser yig* copy of the Tibetan translation, even though the label on the outside of the bundle reads *Vajraccheda-prajñāpāramitā*. Of the two mss of the Vaj listed as having been microfilmed by the Nepal German Manuscript Preservation Project, one (a palm leaf ms in 81 folios, NGMPP E963/5) turns out to be a copy of the *Kāraṇḍavyūha*. The other (Ca 267; NGMPP A913/9; Acc. No 4/267), happily, is indeed the Vaj. It is a paper ms dated 1701 containing a complete copy of the text on 52 folios (not 62, as given in the NGMPP database). This leaves us with a possible total of three mss of the Vaj in Nepal, going by current information, for which we are greatly indebted to the generosity of Akira Yuyama, Christoph Cüppers and Dragomir Dimitrov, who kindly supplied us with copies of the relevant material. These Nepalese mss of the text will repay careful study, if they can be found. At the time of writing, only Ca 267 has come to hand. It is highly corrupt, but its testimony is valuable nonetheless.

¹⁸ It is possible that Frags h and i belong to the same folio.

2. The Manuscript of the Vajracchedikā in the Schøyen Collection

The discovery of a copy of the Vaj in the Schøyen Collection, in the manuscript unit bearing the designation MS 2385, represents a significant addition to our knowledge of the Sanskrit text of the Vaj. However, it is worth noting at the outset that MS 2385 contains not just one sūtra, but two: the *Bhaiṣajyagurusūtra* (Bhg) and the Vaj. The Vaj begins immediately after the Bhg, which ends on fols. 25v4–26r1 with “... the round of teachings, the Mahāyāna sūtra entitled ‘The Unbroken (?) Full Account of the Excellence of All the Vows of the Realized One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabha’ is finished,”¹⁹ and this is followed on 26r1–2 by: “Hail to Śākyamuni, the Realized, Worthy and Perfectly Awakened One!” (*Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya [sa]rvapraṇidhānaviṣaśeṣavistaram abhaṃgaṃ nā<ma> dharma<pa>ryāyaṃ mahāyānasūtram samāptaḥ || ❀ || namo Śākyamunayesa tathāgatāyārhatē samyak sambuddhāya ||*), which invocation precedes the *nidāna* of the Vaj. The folio numbers of the two texts are as follows:

Text 1 Bhg, fols. 1r1–26r1

Text 2: Vaj, fols. 26r1–46v6

These circumstances suggest that at the time this manuscript was produced some Mahāyāna Buddhists regarded the Vaj as one of a set of Mahāyāna sūtras, rather than an independent work. One thinks of the practice in Nepal and elsewhere of copying multiple texts together under the title of *Mahāyānasamgraha* or *Dhāraṇīsamgraha*. Whether or not such titles were applied, we already have ample evidence of such a practice in the Bamiyan area, in the form of the large Mahāyāna Sūtra compendium MS 2378/1 published in Vol. 1 of this series. Even more interesting is the fact that the Gilgit manuscript of the Vaj presents a similar situation. There at least four texts are copied in the same bundle, and although the remainder of the folio (fol. 12) on which the Vaj (the first text in the bundle) ends is left blank, the Bhg begins immediately after on fol. 13.²⁰ That is to say, these two sūtras²¹ once again appear together, even though their order is reversed. In this light, one would be justified in concluding that some Buddhists saw a connection between them. In view of the fact that they were being copied in the same language, script, format and support, it is evident that they were circulating together in the area between Gilgit and Bamiyan (or what Richard Salomon has called “Greater Gandhāra”) by the sixth to seventh centuries, if not earlier.

The Bhg will be the subject of a separate treatment by Gregory Schopen. As far as the Vaj is concerned, the technical details of the portion of the manuscript taken up by it (hereafter referred to as S) are as follows:

Date: ca. 6th–7th century.

Script: Gilgit/Bamiyan Type I, written in a coarse but confident and legible hand. The scribe has frequently resorted to the use of “filler marks” in the form of long dashes (sometimes run together into a single long line, as, e.g., on folio 31v) where he has run into difficulty with the roughness of the writing surface or the lack of sufficient space to accommodate

¹⁹ The reading of this passage and its interpretation are preliminary and tentative, since there are several problematic elements in it (including *sarva* where we would expect *pūrva*). For a definitive treatment we refer the reader to the complete study of the Schøyen Bhg by Gregory Schopen which will appear in the fourth volume of this series.

²⁰ See Chakravarti 1956: 175–176 for the details.

²¹ We use this term loosely here. Nowhere in P, G, or S is the Vaj ever designated as the *Vajracchedikā prajñāpāramitā sūtra*, although the terms *dharmaparyāya*, *sūtra*, and *sūtrānta* are used to refer to it.

the bottom line.

Support: Birch bark, generally in an excellent state of preservation. Occasional breaks in the fabric of the ms have been repaired in the digital images which appear at the end of this volume. These breaks range from the complete splitting apart of some folios to the lifting off of small fragments of the top layer of bark. Obverse and reverse of the birch bark are clearly distinguished, since the obverse has a silvery sheen which the reverse lacks.

Dimensions: Approximately 5–6cm x 18–19cm. Most of the folios have rounded corners, but a few (28, 33, 34, 41, 42) are cut square, and are also much shorter. Since this involves no loss of text, these folios were probably cut to that shape before being inscribed.

Format: Basically, 6 lines per folio. There are, however, some folios with 5 lines (fols. 32, 33, 34 and 45) and one with 7 lines (fol. 28). A stringhole appears to the left of centre, above and below which a space is left on all lines on some folios, although on most the writing continues unbroken around the hole. On the recto of each folio a generous margin accommodates the folio number. Since the text on the verso is right-justified, but is written on the recto with the right edge curving around the folio number, it is possible that the folios were numbered before being inscribed with the text.²²

Extent: 21 folios, numbered 26 to 46. When compared with Conze's edition (Cz), S corresponds to pp. 27.3–46.11 (extending from §1 to almost the end of §16). Müller's edition of the complete text (M) covers 28 pages (pp. 19–46), and because S ends on M's p. 35 (its 17th page), it represents approximately 60% of the full text. We assume therefore that it originally consisted of about 35 folios.

The survival rate of S is thus roughly the same as that of the Gilgit ms (G). Moreover, since it is the first half of G which is missing, by combining S with G it is possible to gain an overall picture of the Vaj as it was circulating around the sixth century in Greater Gandhāra. A critical examination of S, therefore, should enable us to understand the evolution of the text edited by Conze (Cz), which is so widely used at present. In other words, it has now become possible to plot the development of the complete text of the Vaj over a thousand years and more as it spread from Gandhāra to Tibet and as far as Japan. The Schøyen manuscript is thus of great significance for the future study of Prajñāpāramitā literature and of Mahāyāna Buddhism in general.

3. The Schøyen Manuscript and Its Relationship with Other Extant Manuscripts

We begin by comparing the extent of coverage of the Schøyen ms (S) with that of the two other mss thought to be of about the same date, that is, the Gilgit ms as edited by Schopen (G) and the Central Asian ms edited by Pargiter (P). The following diagram shows the extant portions of these three mss with reference to the sections, pages and lines of Cz.

²² It appears that the scribe did this folio by folio, rather than numbering all the folios before copying the text.

Three Ancient Mss of the Vaj

S	fols. 26–46 §§1–16c (27.3–46.11)				fols. 47ff. LOST	
G	fols. 1–4 LOST		fol. 5 §§13b– 14e (38.6– 41.20)	fol. 6 LOST	fols. 7–12 §§15b–32b (44.6–63.2)	
P	fol. 1 LOST	fol. 2 §§2–4 (27.22 – 29.15)	fols. 3–5 LOST		fols. 6–11 §§10b–16c (35.24–46.8)	fol. 12 LOST
						fols. 13–19 §§17b–32b (48.2–63.2)

As is evident from the above diagram, there is a partial overlap between S and G, and so it is possible to compare the readings of the two. In concrete terms, S 39r1–42r4 corresponds to G 5a1–5b7 (Cz 38.6–41.19), and S 44v6–46v6 corresponds to G 7a1–7b4 (Cz 44.6–46.11). Although the two manuscripts generally tally, they are not identical, and there are many minor differences in wording. Furthermore, when S is compared with P, considered to be the oldest manuscript, it is evident that S is the manuscript closest in content to P. There is no space here to undertake a detailed analysis of all the differences and similarities, but the features of S discussed below in the next two sections of our introduction are generally typical of the older manuscripts G and P rather than the more recent witnesses on which Müller's edition is based.

4. Linguistic Characteristics of S

The language of S is a fairly regular Sanskrit, rather close to that of G, without the more obvious Prakritic colouring that can be observed in P. While it is often difficult to isolate genuine linguistic features from simple scribal errors, a number of characteristics can be noted. They do not necessarily occur consistently throughout the manuscript, but they do at least indicate certain tendencies in it.

The most salient feature is that the rules of sandhi are often ignored. For example, final and initial vowels are frequently left unchanged, a hiatus being preferred to vowel combination consistent with sandhi rules. Further, the manuscript is especially indifferent to the rules of sandhi applying to the *visarga*. In assessing such cases one must of course always be alert to the fact that the non-application of sandhi is an alternative form of punctuation, so only instances in which punctuation is clearly not an issue are given below as examples.

(1) Sandhi rules for vowels are not always observed.

[1] Similar vowels do not coalesce.

vā arūpiṇo vā asaṃjñino (28r2–3), *mayā anāgāmiphalaṃ* (35r2), *mayā ārādhitā* (46r4).

[2] *a* or *ā* do not merge with simple dissimilar vowels or diphthongs to produce their full or lengthened grade (guṇa or vṛddhi).

srotāpan[n]asya evaṃ (34r1), *vā imaṃ* (43v1), *vā imān* (45v2).

[3] *i*, *ī*, *u*, *ū* and *r* do not shift to the corresponding semivowels before dissimilar vowels.
diśi ākāśasya (28v7), *bhavati arham* (35v4), *araṇāvihārīti araṇāvihārītīti* (36r1), *dhvani asaṃkhyeye* (46r2).

[4] *Abhinihita* sandhi is ignored, and a hiatus occurs instead.

sarve anupadhiśeṣe (28r4); *sarve te aprameye* (30v6), *tenocyate anāgāmīti* (35r3–4).

(It is therefore not surprising that S also prefers to leave the hiatus after the vocative *subhūte*.)

[5] A final *e* before an initial vowel other than *a* does not become *a*.

ye imeṣv (29v6, 30r2, 30v4), *prthivī[pra]deśe ito* (38r3), *te āścaryeṇa* (38r6), *ukte āyusmān* (38v2), *pr[thi]vīpradeśe idam* (45r4).

(2) Sandhi rules for consonants and especially *h* (visarga) are not always observed.

[1] Visarga before *t* does not become *s*.

subhūtiḥ tasyām (26v5), *lakṣaṇālakṣaṇataḥ tathāgato* (29v3–4), *dha[r]maḥ tathāgate[na]* (36r3–4), *yaḥ tathāgatena* (43r1–2), *[dha]rmaparyāyaḥ tathāgatena* (44r6).

[2] Before a voiced sound visarga does not become *r*.

ājānadbhiḥ dharmāḥ (31v5), *subhūtiḥ dharma°* (40r1).

[3] Changes of *aḥ* and *āḥ*.

(a) Before any vowel other than *a*, *aḥ* does not become *a* followed by a hiatus.

sakṛd[ā]gāminah evam (34v1–2), *bhagavaṃtaḥ ārāgitā* (46r4–5). (However, in such situations *aḥ* sometimes becomes *o* followed by a hiatus: *sakṛdāgāmīno evam* (34v3–4), *arhamto evam* (35r4–5)! But note also *dharmodgrahītavyo* instead of *dharma udgrahītavyo* (31v4).)

(b) Before *a*, *aḥ* does not become *o* with *a* disappearing.

bodhisatvaḥ apratiṣṭhito (28v5), *punyaskandhaḥ askandha* (33r2), *bhāṣitaḥ arajaḥ* (39r4).

(However, when this rule is applied, the lost *a* is, as usual in these mss, not indicated by *avagraha*.)

(c) Before a voiced consonant, *aḥ* does not become *o*.

bhikṣavaḥ yena (26v3), *dharmāḥ yaḥ* (34v5).

(d) Before a voiced sound, *āḥ* does not become *ā*.

mahāsatvāḥ anupariḡhītāḥ (27r2–3), *[sa]tvāḥ bhaviṣyamty* (29v5), *satvāḥ aprameyam* (43v3), *satvāḥ aprameyeṇa* (44v4–5). (However, the scribe twice writes *kulaputro vā* where he should have written *kulaputrā vā*, at 43r6 & 45v2.)

For all these examples, just as many if not more cases can be found where the relevant rules are applied correctly, so the ms is simply inconsistent. This inconsistency is especially noticeable with respect to visarga, which is often left off where we would expect it, even in sentence-final position (e.g. 39v1). How much of this is due to scribal carelessness is unclear. But we note that the use of *anusvāra* is also often in error, with the dot above the letter being left out where it is needed and put in where it is not, so that occasionally one has the impression that the scribe went back and wrote it in afterwards. There are similar instances with the use of *e-mātrā*.

In other respects apart from sandhi the language of the text only occasionally departs from the classical norm in any significant way, even though it contains much BHS vocabulary. This is also true of the later witnesses. Hybrid forms which are not found in M and Cz, however, are, for example, *evārūpa* used interchangeably with *evamrūpa* (see 29v6, 30v4, cf. 30r2), *catuspadika* for *catuspādika* (33r5–v1, 38r1, 38r3–4, 39v5–6), *lokadhātu* as fem. (e.g. 39r5), *carima* (46r5), and so on. We also find four times (28r6, 33v5, 34v4–5, 42v2) the use of the ablative phrase *tat kasmād*

dhetoh instead of what is in M and Cz the invariable *tat kasya hetoh*.²³ None of these features is particularly unusual or archaic, indicating that S, like G, represents a recension of the text which has moved somewhat further than P in the direction of linguistic standardisation, although it has still not reached the point represented by M and Cz.

5. The Content of S in Comparison with Cz

Generally speaking, to state the conclusion first, it is also evident that in terms of content S lies somewhere near G on a continuum stretching from P to Cz. It should not be inferred from this that all our witnesses represent points in a single line of transmission, and are thus vertically related, but a general trend is clear enough. That trend is towards the introduction in Cz of words and phrases not present in S, or the amplification of words and phrases already found in S. In most such cases the readings of S are very similar to those of P, G, and the early Chinese translations such as that of Kumārajīva. We can thus see that the Vaj has tended to expand over time, even though the basic framework of the text has remained much the same.

The following nine points are illustrative of this process. It will be seen that they range from the presence or absence of single words to the inclusion or omission of lengthy phrases. To avoid unnecessary complexity, reference is given only to folios of S and page and line numbers of Cz. The reader need only check our Reconstruction and consult the footnotes to it to see exactly how and where Cz (and M)²⁴ differ from S. The same footnotes will also indicate whether P and G read with S or against it.²⁵

[1] Subhūti is not addressed in the vocative in S, but is in Cz

S: 28r1 (cf. Cz 28.19); 29r4 (cf. Cz 30.2); 30v6 (cf. Cz 31.13); 31r4 (cf. Cz 31.19); 38r6 (cf. Cz 37.17); 38v1 (cf. Cz 37.18); 41r3 (cf. Cz 40.18); 41r6 (cf. Cz 41.2); 42v5 (cf. Cz 42.7); 43v3 (cf. Cz 43.5); 44r6 (cf. Cz 43.20); 44v4 (cf. Cz 44.4); 45v4 (cf. Cz 45.2).

In these 13 instances the vocative *subhūte* which appears in Cz is missing in S. There are only a few cases where the reverse is true. While this does not of course make any great difference to the overall meaning, it indicates the more concise nature of S. The same pattern is found with the vocative *bhagavan*.

[2] The term *bodhisattva* (always written *bodhisatva*) tends to appear alone in S, and is rarely amplified by the companion term *mahāsattva* (*mahāsatva*), as it often is in Cz. This is the case in the following 9 places:

S: 27r4 (cf. Cz 28.2); 27v1 (cf. Cz 28.9); 27v2 (cf. Cz 28.10–11); 28v4 (cf. Cz 29.12–13); 30r6 (cf. Cz 31.4); 31r1–2 (cf. Cz 31.15); 31r3 (cf. Cz 31.17–18); 31r5–6 (cf. Cz 31.20–21); 36v2 (cf. Cz 35.25–26).

To these add the most striking example, the addition in the *nidāna* of Cz (27.6) of *sambahulaiś ca bodhisattvair mahāsattvaih*, which has no counterpart at all in the *nidāna* of S (26r4),²⁶ as well as two other places where Cz has *bodhisattva mahāsattva*, but S has nothing: 30v3 (cf. Cz 31.8);

²³ On this use of the ablative see Speijer, 1886, §193, pp. 137–140, n. 1.

²⁴ Hereafter in this section we refer only to Cz, but in all cases it may be assumed that Cz reads with M.

²⁵ If P and G's readings are not mentioned specifically in the notes, one can infer that they agree with S.

²⁶ Similarly, *bodhisattvas* are mentioned as members of the assembly in the conclusion (§32b) of M and Cz, but not in P or G.

31v4 (cf. Cz 32.1–2).

There are in total eighteen instances of the word *mahāsattva* in Cz, and they all appear together with *bodhisattva*. Of these eighteen, fifteen appear in the section corresponding to the extant S (as far as Cz 46.11). An analysis of the corresponding passages in S reveals that in nine instances the word *mahāsattva* is missing, and in a further three instances the entire phrase containing *bodhisattva mahāsattva* is missing. Thus the word *mahāsattva* is used only three times in S (at 27r2–3, 30r4, 42r3–4), and is comparatively rare.²⁷

[3] The formula “Realized, Worthy and Fully Awakened One” (*tathāgata, arhat, samyaksambuddha*) is sometimes truncated.

In several cases, S has the word *tathāgata* alone, whereas Cz amplifies this to the full formula comprising three terms:

S: 27r3 (cf. Cz 28.1–2); 33v4 (cf. Cz 33.22).

Once again, there is nothing especially significant about this, and there are plenty of instances where the full set of three terms is found both in S and in Cz. We leave out of account here the places where the term *arhat* occurs on its own, since in these passages the subject is the various grades of noble person (*āryapudgala*) and the like.

See also the next point.

[4] The phrase *dānaṃ dadyāt* appears without further specification.

There are three instances where S has the phrase *dānaṃ dadyāt* (32v3, 33r5, 38r1), while Cz amplifies this by specifying the recipient of the gift in question, viz. *tathāgatebhyo ’rhadbhyah samyaksambuddhebhyo* (33.5–6, 33.16–17, 37.5–7). But there is one case where S also adds this phrase (37v2–3, cf. Cz 36.21–22).

[5] The sentence “the Realized One knows them, the Realized One sees them” appears without instrumental amplification.

Three times in the extant portion of S (30v5–6; 43v1–2; 44v3–4) the text says *jñātās te subhūte tathāgatena dr̥ṣṭās te subhūte tathāgatena* (“the Realized One knows them, Subhūti, the Realized One sees them, Subhūti”). In Cz (31.10–12; 43.3–5; 44.1–3) the means by which this knowing and seeing take place is further specified: *jñātās te subhūte tathāgatena buddhajñānena, dr̥ṣṭās te subhūte tathāgatena buddhacakṣuṣā* (“the Realized One knows them, Subhūti, by means of the cognition of a Buddha, the Realized One sees them, Subhūti, by means of the eye of a Buddha”).

It is doubtful whether one could draw any conclusions from this about the development of the concepts of *buddhajñāna* and *buddhacakṣus*, especially as in the case of the latter the term is also attested in §18a of the Vaj, as it appears in both P and G.

[6] The stock phrase enquiring after the reason for something (*tat kasya hetoḥ*) is absent.

The stock phrase *tat kasya hetoḥ*, alternatively *tat kasmād dhetoḥ*, so common in the Prajñāpāramitā sūtras, with their question-and-answer style of discourse, is absent in seven places in S (35v2; 39r3; 40r6; 42r1 (problematic passage); 42v6; 45v4; 46r1) where it occurs in Cz (35.6; 38.11; 39.18–19; 41.14 (?); 42.9; 45.2; 45.6).

²⁷ It is also of note that, in the first and third of these passages, where P is also extant, P lacks the word *mahāsattva*, which in that text is attested only once, in §32a.

[7] The beings for whose sake the Buddha teaches the Vaj are not specified.

In Cz, in §14a (39.11–14), Subhūti exclaims “It is a marvellous thing, Lord, it is a most marvellous thing, Blessed One, that this round of teachings has been preached by the Realized One for the sake of living beings who have set out on the highest way, for the sake of those who have set out on the best way” (Cz: *āścaryam bhagavan paramāścaryam sugata, yāvad ayam dharmaparyāya tathāgatena bhāṣito ’grayānasamprasthitānām sattvānām arthāya śreṣṭhayānasamprasthitānām arthāya*). In the corresponding passage in S (40r2–3), the sentence stops at *bhāṣitaḥ*, and the phrase *agrayānasamprasthitānām*, etc., does not appear. Although an equivalent is found in Xuanzang’s translation (最上乘 ... 最勝乘 “the highest vehicle ... the supreme vehicle”), the phrase is absent from all the other Chinese versions, from the Tibetan translation, and from P and G as well. Thus this claim that the Vaj has been taught for the benefit of followers of the Mahāyāna is revealed as a later addition to this particular passage, but not, it must be stressed, to the text as a whole, since the very same phrase also occurs in both S and P at §15b.

[8] In S the set of actions performed with regard to the sūtra appears in truncated form.

In Mahāyāna sūtras, a list of things which one does with a text is expressed in the following set phrase, or in variations on it: “They will learn this round of teachings, bear it in mind, recite it, master it, and illuminate it for others in full” (*imaṃ dharmaparyāyam udgrahīṣyanti dhārayiṣyanti vācayiṣyanti paryavāpsyanti parebhyas ca vistareṇa samprakāśayiṣyanti*). Here, the final operation (*parebhyas ca vistareṇa samprakāśayiṣyanti*) merits special attention in that it refers to active propagation among others.

Of the 14 instances of this formula or variants of it in Cz, 12 occur in the part of the text covered by S.²⁸ Leaving out the object of the verbs in question (*gāthā*, *dharmaparyāya*, etc.), they run as follows, with the altered or amplified wording in Cz in bold:

- §8. S 33v1: *udgrhya parebhyo deśayet samprakāśayed* > Cz 33.19: *udgrhya parebhyo **vistareṇa deśayet samprakāśayed***;
- §11. S 38r1–2: *udgrhya parebhyo deśayet* > Cz 37.8: *udgrhya parebhyo deśayet **samprakāśayed***;
- §12. S 38r4: *bhāṣyeta vā deśyeta vā* > Cz 37.16: ***udgrhya bhāṣyeta vā samprakāśyeta vā***;
S 38r6: *dhārayiṣyamti* > Cz 37.15–17: *dhārayiṣyanti **vācayiṣyanti paryavāpsyanti parebhyas ca vistareṇa samprakāśayiṣyanti***;
- §13e. S 39v6: *udgrhya parebhyo deśayet* > Cz 39.6: *udgrhya parebhyo deśayet **samprakāśayed***;
- §14b. S 40v3: *udgrhīṣyamti paryavāpsyamti dhā(ra)yiṣyamti* > Cz 40.6–8: *udgrahīṣyanti dhārayiṣyanti **vācayiṣyanti paryavāpsyanti parebhyas ca vistareṇa samprakāśayiṣyanti***;
- §14h. S 43v1: *udgrahīṣyamti : dhāra(yi)ṣyamti / vāc(a)yiṣyamti* </> *paryavāpsyamti* > Cz 43.1–3: *udgrahīṣyanti dhārayiṣyanti vācayiṣyanti paryavāpsyanti **parebhyas ca vistareṇa samprakāśayiṣyanti***;
- §15a. S 44r3–5: *likhitvodgrhṇ(ī)yāt* </> *dhārayet* </> *vācayet* </> *paryavāpnuyāt* </> *parebhyas ca vistareṇa samprakāśayet* > Cz 43.17–19: *likhitvodgrhṇīyād dhārayed vācayet paryavāpnuyāt **parebhyas ca vistareṇa samprakāśayet***;
- §15b. S 44v2–3: *udgrahīṣyamti / dhārayiṣyamti / vācayiṣya<m>ti* </> *paryavāpsyamti* > Cz 43.23–44.1: *udgrahīṣyanti dhārayiṣyanti vācayiṣyanti paryavāpsyanti **parebhyas ca***

²⁸ For the remaining two occurrences see §§24, 32a.

vistareṇa samprakāśayiṣyanti;

45r3: *śrotum udgrahītum vā dhārayitum vā vācayitum vā paryavāptu(m) vā* > Cz 44.12–13: *śrotum vodgrahītum vā dhārayitum vā vācayitum vā paryavāptum vā.*

§16a. S 45v3: *udgrahīṣyaṃti dhārayiṣyaṃti paryavāpsyāṃti* > Cz 44.19–45.1: *udgrahīṣyanti dhārayiṣyanti vācayiṣyanti paryavāpsyanti yoniśaś ca manasikariṣyanti parebhyaś ca vistareṇa samprakāśayiṣyanti;*

§16b. S 46r6–v1: *(u)d(gra)hīṣ(ya)ṃti dhāra(y)i(ṣya)ṃ(t)i v(āca)yi(ṣya)ṃ(t)i (pa)ryavāpsyāṃti* > Cz 45.15–17: *udgrahīṣyanti dhārayiṣyanti vācayiṣyanti paryavāpsyanti parebhyaś ca vistareṇa samprakāśayiṣyanti.*

It can be seen from the above examples that the trend in Cz is always towards amplification and standardisation of the formula. This formula is certainly known to S, but is given only once (in §15a) in its full form. The later recension of the Vaj, by contrast, was more inclined to give this formula, like others, in full (i.e. *vistareṇa*!).

[9] The eschatological formula is given in shortened form in S or not at all.

That the well-known Buddhist eschatological formula (*anāgate 'dhvani paścime kāle paścime samaye paścimāyāṃ pañcaśatyāṃ saddharmavipralope* or similar) was added to the Vaj as it evolved from the text as known from G to that represented by Cz has already been maintained in Watanabe 1999. At first sight S suggests a similar situation. Once again, words added or changed in Cz appear in bold.

§6(i). S 29v5–6: *anāgate 'dhvani paścimāyāṃ pañcaśatyā<ṃ> vartamānāyāṃ* > Cz 30.16–18: *anāgate 'dhvani **paścime kāle paścime samaye** paścimāyāṃ pañcaśatyāṃ **saddharma-vipralopakāle** vartamāne;*

§6(ii). S 30r2: *anāgate 'dhvani* > Cz 30.22–24: *anāgate 'dhvani **paścime kāle paścime samaye paścimāyāṃ pañcaśatyāṃ saddharmavipralope** vartamāne;*

§6(iii). S 30r3–4: *anāgate 'dhvani ... paścimāyāṃ pañcaśatyāṃ saddharmavipralope* > Cz 30.26–31.1: *anāgate 'dhvani ... **paścime kāle paścime samaye** paścimāyāṃ pañcaśatyāṃ **saddharmavipralope** vartamāne;*

§14b. S 40v2 (entire eschatological phrase missing) > Cz 40.3–5: ***anāgate 'dhvani paścime kāle paścime samaye paścimāyāṃ pañcaśatyāṃ saddharmavipralopa** vartamāne;*

§16b S 46r5–6: *carime kāle paścimi(k)āyāṃ pañcā(śa)tyāṃ vartamānāyāṃ* > Cz 45.13–14: ***paścime kāle paścime samaye** paścimāyāṃ pañcaśatyāṃ **saddharmavipralopakāle** vartamāna.*

In these five cases we see the same pattern as before. The basic idea is attested in S, and all the elements of the formula can be found in it (including the important term *saddharmavipralopa*), but generally S does not give the formula in full. In the later recension, by contrast, the formula is fuller and more standardised.

The above list of differences is not exhaustive, there being many other passages in which the text of S is either considerably shorter than that of Cz, or less standardised in its wording. Both these features are especially evident in the “signature formula” of the Vaj, the affirmation-negation-affirmation sequence, when one compares S with Cz. Because of the wide range of variations and the complexity of the passages in question, readers would be best advised to consult our Reconstruction and the following English Translation directly. It should always be borne in mind, however, that in

some cases we may not be dealing with a genuinely shorter recension, but with the results of scribal error in the form of omission of passages due to eye-skip. Some of these possibilities are discussed in the notes to the English translation. Sections §§9a–d, for example, are typical of this kind of situation, and, since they are not extant in either P or G, need to be carefully studied with reference to the Chinese translations. We omit such passages from consideration here, not only because they are rather complex, but also because they do not illustrate any general features of S apart from the ones we already hope to have established: that S tends to be shorter and less standardised than the recension represented by Cz. These features S shares with P and G (and the Central Asian fragments), in the same way as it tends to share their linguistic characteristics.

II. Transliteration

1) MS 2385/21; folio 26 recto (Cz 27.1–8)

- 1 || ❀ || namo śākyamuna
 2 yes tathāgatāyārhatē samyaksambuddhāya : || evaṃ mayā śrutam ekasmin [sa]ma
 3 ye bhagavān* śrāvastyāṃ viharati sma · jetavane · anāthapiṇḍadasyārame maha
 4 tā bhikṣusamghena sārddham aOrdhatrayodaśabhir bhikṣusataiḥ atha khalu bhagavān*
 5 pūrvāhṇakālasamaye nivāsyā [pā]tracivaram ādāya · śrāvastīm mahānagarīm pi
 6 ṇḍāya prāviśat* atha khalu bhagavan* śrāvastīm mahānagarī piṇḍāyaṃ cari

verso (Cz 27.8–19)

- 1 tvā paścādbhaktapiṇḍapātapatikkrāntaḥ pādaḥ prakṣālyā nyaṣīdat bhagavān* prajñapta e
 2 vāsane paryamkam ābhujya rjuṃ kāyaṃ praṇidhāya pratimukhaṃ smṛtim upasthāpya · atha
 3 sambahulā bhikṣavaḥ yena bhagavāṃs tenopasaṃkkramann upasaṃkkramya bhagavataḥ
 4 pādaḥ śirasābhivandya bhagavaṃOtaṃ trḥpradakṣiṇīkṛtvā kāmte nyaṣīdan* tena khalu pu
 5 naḥ samayenāyusmān subhūtiḥ tasyāṃ eva pariśadi sannipatito bhūt sannīṣaṇṇaḥ
 6 atha khalv āyusmān subhūtir utthyāyāsanād ekāṃsam ut[t]arāsaṃgaṃ kṛtvā dakṣiṇaṃ jā

2) MS 2385/20, uf1/4s; folio 27 recto (Cz 27.19–28.8)

- 1 nnumaṇḍala[m] pṛthivyāṃ pratiṣṭhāpya yena bhagavāṃs tenāṃjalim praṇāmya bhagavaṃtam
 etad a
 2 vocat* āścaryaṃ bhagavan yāvad evaṃ tathāgatenārhatā samyaksambuddhena bodhisatvā
 ma
 3 hāsatvāḥ anupariḡhītāḥ paramēṇānugraheṇa : yāvad eva [ta]thāgatena bo
 4 dhisatvāḥ parittāḥ paramaOyā parindanayā · kathaṃ bhagava bodhisatvayā
 5 nasamprasthitena sthātavyam* kathaṃ pratipattapavyam* kaṃthaṃ ci — — — — — ttaṃ prati
 6 ḡhītavyam* evaṃ ukte bhagavān āyusmaṃtaṃ subhūtim etad av. c. t* sādhu

verso (Cz 28.8–28.17)

- 1 sādhu subhūte evaṃ etat subhūte anupariḡh[ī]tās tathāgatena bodhisat.[ā] .. + +
 2 meṇānugraheṇa · parittās tathāgatena bodhisatvāḥ — — — — —
 3 paramayānuparindanayā · tena hi subhūte śṛṇu sādhu — — — — —

- 4 ca suṣṭhu ca manasikuru bhāṣiṣye · yathā bodhisatvayānasamprasthi[tena] sthā[ta]vyam*
 5 yathā pratipattavyam* yathā cittam pratigṛhītavyam* evaṃ bhagavān i + .. śmān subhūti
 6 r bhagavaṃtaḥ pratyāśrauṣīt* bhagavāms tān etad avocat* iha subhūte bodhisatvayāna

3) MS 2385/19, uf1/4x; folio 28 recto (Cz 28.18–29.5)

- 1 nasamprasthitair evaṃ cittam utpādayitavyam* yāvaṃtaḥ satvāḥ satvasaṃg[r]aheṇa saṃgrhī
 2 tāḥ aṇḍajā vā jarāyujā vā saṃsvedajā vā ūpapādukā vā rūpiṇo vā arūpiṇo
 3 vā asaṃjñino vā asaṃjñino vā naiva saṃjñino nāsaṃjñinaḥ yāvat satvadhātuh prajña
 4 pyamānaḥ pra – – jñāpyamte ○ te mayā sarve anupadhiśeṣe nirvāṇadhātau pari
 5 nipayitavyāḥ evaṃ aparimāṇāms ca satvān* parinivāpayitavyāḥ na ca kaścit satva
 6 parinirvāpito bhavati · tat kasmād dhetoḥ sacet subhūte bodhisatvasya satvasaṃjñā
 7 pravartate na sa bodhisatva iti naktavyaḥ tat [ka]s[ya] hetoḥ na s[u] subhūte bodhi[sa]

verso (Cz 29.5–18)

- 1 tvo vaktavyo yasya satvasaṃjñā pravarteta jīvasaṃjñā vā pudgalasaṃjñā vā pravarteta api
 tu
 2 khalu punaḥ subhūte bodhisatvena stupratīṣṭhitena dānaṃ dātavya[m]* na kvacitpratiṣṭhitena
 dā
 3 naṃ tavyam* na rūpapratiṣṭhitena dānaṃ dātavyaṃ na śabdagandharasaspraṣṭavye[ṣu] na
 dharmaprati
 4 ṣṭhitena dānaṃ dātavyam* evaṃ hi ○ subhūte bodhisatvena dānaṃ dātavyam* yathā na
 nimi
 5 ttasaṃjñāyāṃ pratiṣṭhe[t*] tat kasya hetoḥ yaḥ subhūte bodhisatvaḥ apratiṣṭhito dānaṃ
 6 dadā[t]i .. sya subh.te puṇyaskandhasya na sukaraṃ pramāṇam udgrahītum* tat [k]iṃ manyase
 su
 7 bh. te sukaraṃ .. [v]. syāṃ diśi ākāśasya pramā[ṇa]m udgrahītum* subhūter āha ·

4) MS 2385/18, uf1/4o, uf1/4h; folio 29 recto (Cz 29.18–30.8)

- 1 no hīdaṃ bhagavan* evaṃ dakṣiṇapaścimottarā ūrdhvaṃ vidikṣu-r-avidikṣ[u] : daśa[su]
 di]kṣ[u] : su
 2 karaṃ ākāśasya pramāṇam udgrahītum* subhūtir [ā]ha · na hīdaṃ bhagavan* + + .. [ā]
 3 ha · evaṃ eta subhūte · evaṃ etat subhūte yo bodhisat[v]o pratiṣṭhito dānaṃ
 4 dadāti tasya puṇyaskandhasya ○ na sukaraṃ pramāṇam u[d]grahītum* api [t]u [kha]lu
 5 punaḥ subhūte evaṃ bodhisatvena dānamayaṃ puṇyakṛyāvastuṃ dānaṃ dātavyam* tat
 k[i]ṃ
 6 manyase subhūte tathāgato lakṣaṇasaṃpadā draṣṭavyaḥ bhagavān āha na lakṣaṇa

verso (Cz 30.8–19)

- 1 saṃpadā tathāgato draṣṭavyāḥ tat kasya hetoḥ [yā] sā ta[thā]gatena lakṣaṇasaṃpad bhāṣi
 2 tāḥ saivālakṣaṇasaṃpadāt* evaṃ ukte bhaga[vān] āyuṣmaṃtaṃ subhūtim etad avocat* ya
 3 vat sute lakṣaṇaṃ tāvaṃ mṛṣā · yāvad alakṣaṇaṃ tāva[d a]mṛ[ṣā] iti hi lakṣaṇālakṣaṇataḥ
 4 tathāgato draṣṭavyaḥ || eva○m ukte ā[y]u[ṣm]ān subh[ū]ti bhagavaṃtam etad avocat* a
 5 sti bhagavan kecit [sa]tvāḥ bhaviṣyamty anāgate dhvani paśc[i]māyāṃ pañcāśatyā vartamānā

verso (Cz 33.1–10)

- 1 na sa dharmo nādharmāḥ tat kasya hetoḥ asaṃskṛtathābhāvitā hy āryapudgalāḥ tat kiṃ ma
- 2 nyase subhūte ya imāṃ tṛsāhasramahāsāha[s]r. lokadhātum saptaratnapratipū
- 3 ṛṇam kṛtvā dānam dadyāt* tat kiṃ ○ manyase subhūte [a]pi nu sa kulaputro vā kula
- 4 duhitā vā tatonidānam bahu puṇyam prasunuyā[t]* subhūtir āha · bahu bhagava
- 5 n bahu sugata : sa kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā tatonidā[n]am bahu puṇyam +

8) MS 2385/14; folio 33 recto (Cz 33.10–18)

- 1 sunuyāḥ tat kasya hetoḥ sa eva bhagavann askandha[h] + .m.t tathāga
- 2 to bhāṣate puṇyaskandhaḥ askandha iti bhagavan bhagavān āha · yaś ca
- 3 – – khalu punaḥ subhū○te kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā imāṃ
- 4 – tṛsāhasrāmahāsāhasrām lokadhātum saptaratnapratipū
- 5 – ṛṇam kṛtvā dānam dadāt* yaś ceto dharmaparyāyad amṭaśaś catu

verso (Cz 33.18–25)

- 1 śpadikām api gāthām udgrhya pare[bh]yo deśayet saṃprakāśayed a[ya]
- 2 m eva tatonidānam bahutaram puṇyam [pra]sunuyāt* aprameyam asaṃ
- 3 khyeyam tat kasya heto[h] ○ ato nirjātā hi subhūte tathāgatā
- 4 nām anuttarā samyaksambodhiḥ ato nirjātāś ca buddhā bhagavataḥ
- 5 tat kasmād dhetoḥ buddhadharmāḥ buddhadharmā iti subhūte abuddhadharmā

9) MS 2385/13; folio 34 recto (Cz 33.25–34.8)

- 1 ś caiva te · tat ki[m] manyase subhūte api nu srotāpan[n]asya evaṃ bhavati
- 2 mayā srotāpattiphalaṃ prāptam iti · subhūtir āha · no hīdam bhagava
- 3 n bhagavān āha · tat kasya ○ hetoḥ na hi sa bhagavan kiṃcid āpanna te
- 4 nocyate srotāpanna iti · na rūpam āpanno na śabdā na gandhā na rasā
- 5 – – – – n na spraṣṭavyān na dharmān āpan[n]aḥ tanocyate srotāpanna iti ·

verso (Cz 34.8–18)

- 1 bhagavān āha · tat kiṃ manyase subhūte api nu sakṛd[ā]gāmināḥ
- 2 evaṃ bhaven mayā sakṛdāgāmiphalaṃ prāptam iti · subhūtir āha · no hī
- 3 daṃ bhagavan bhagavān ā○ha · tat kasye hetoḥ na sakṛdāgāmi
- 4 no evaṃ bhaviti mayā sakṛdāgāmiphalaṃ prāptam iti · tat kasmā
- 5 d dhetoḥ na hi sa kaścid dharmāḥ yaḥ sakṛdāgāmitvam āpannaḥ te

10) MS 2385/12; folio 35 recto (Cz 34.18–35.4)

- 1 + .y. .. + .ṛdāgāmīti · bhagavān āha · tat kiṃ manyase subhūte · a – – –
- 2 pi nv anāgāmīna · evaṃ bhavati mayā anāgāmiphalaṃ prāptam iti – – –
- 3 tat kasya hetoḥ na sa kaścid dharmāḥ yo nāgāmīti · samanupaśyati · teno
- 4 cyate anāgāmīti · bha○gavān āha · tat kiṃ manyase subhūte · api tv arhaṃ
- 5 to evaṃ bhavati mayārhatvaṃ prāptam iti · subhūtir āha · no hīdam bhagavan* tat ka
- 6 + .e .o .. [h]i [bha]gavan* sa kaścid dharmo yo rhan nāmaḥ ya saced bhagavann arha

verso (Cz 35.4–13)

- 1 ++ [v]. .m. + .. [tv]. .r. [p]tam iti · sa eva tasyātmagrāho bhavet* satvagrāho j.
- 2 + grāhaḥ pudgalagrāho bhavet* aham asmin bhagavan* || tathāgatenārhatā samya
- 3 kṣaṃbuddhenāraṇavihāriṇāOm agryo nirdiṣṭaḥ aham asmin bhagavann arhan vigata
- 4 rāgaḥ na ca me bhagavann evaṃ bhavati arham asminn arhānn iti · sacen mama bhagava
- 5 nn evaṃ bhaven mayārhatvaṃ prāptam iti · na me tathāgato vyākariṣyati · araṇā — — — — —
- 6 .i .ā .i + + [g]rya iti subhūti · kulaputro na kvacid viharati : — — — — —

11) MS 2385/11; folio 36 recto (Cz 35.13–23)

- 1 tenocyate · araṇāvihārīti araṇāvihārīti · bhagavān āha · tat kiṃ manyasya
- 2 subhūte · kaścid dharmat tathāgatena dīpaṃkarāt tathāgatārhatā samyakṣaṃbuddhā
- 3 d udgrhītaḥ subhūtir āha · no hidaṃ bhagavan bhagavān āha · na sa kaścid dha[r]maḥ
- 4 tathāgate[na] dīpaṃkarāt taOthāgatād arhataḥ samyakṣaṃbuddhād udgrhītaḥ bhagavā
- 5 n āha : ya kaścit subhūte bodhisatvo evaṃ vaded ahaṃ kṣetravyūhān niṣpādayiṣyāmi
- 6 ti sa vitatha vadet* tat kasya hetoḥ kṣetravyūhā kṣetra — — — — —

verso (Cz 35.23–36.6)

- 1 vyūhā iti subhūte avyūhā hy ete tathāgatena bhāṣitā te — nocyaṃte kṣetravyūhā i
- 2 ti tas[m]āt tarhi subhūte bodhisatvena evaṃ cittam utpādayitavyaṃ apratiṣṭhitam na rūpa
- 3 pratiṣṭhitam cittam utpādayiOtaṃ · na śabdagandharasaspraṣṭavyadharmapratīṣṭhi —
- 4 tam cittam utpādayitavyam* na [k]vacitpratiṣ[ṭh]i[tam] cittam utpādayitavyam* tad yathā .i
- 5 nāma subhūte puru[ṣ]o bhavet* yasyai[va]mrūpam ātmabhāvaḥ syāt tad yathā[pi] +
- 6 meroḥ parvatarājā · tat [k]i manyase su — — — — —

12) MS 2385/10; folio 37 recto (Cz 36.6–18)

- 1 bhūte mahān sa ātmabhāvo bhavet* subhūtir āha · [ma]hān bhagavaṃ mahā s[u]gata [:] .. +
- 2 tmabhāvo bhavet* bhagavan* tat [k]asya het[o]ḥ abhāvaḥ sa tathāgate[na bhāṣ]itaḥ tena
- 3 cyate ā[t]ma[bhāva] iti · na [hi] s[a] bhāvaḥ t[e]n[o]cyate ātmabhāva iti · || bhagavān āha ·
- 4 t kiṃ man[ya]se subhūte [yā]Ovaṃtyo gaṃgānadyāṃ vālukās tāvaṃtya evaṃ gaṃgānad[y]o
- 5 bha
- 5 veyuḥ api nu tāsu bahv[y]o vālu[kā] bhavedyūḥ subhūtir āha · tā eva tāvad bhagavan ba
- 6 hvyo gaṃgānadyo bhavedyūḥ prāg eva yās tāsu vālukāḥ bhagavān āha · ārocayami

verso (Cz 36.18–37.5)

- 1 te subhūte prative[dh]ayāmi te yāvaṃtyas tāsu gaṃgānadiṣu vālukā bhavedyūḥ tāvaṃ
- 2 tyo lokādhātavaḥ kaścid eva strī vā p[u]ruṣo vā saptaratnapratipūrṇaṃ kṛtvā tathā
- 3 gatebhyo rhadbhyaḥ samyakṣaṃbuOddhebhyaḥ dānaṃ dadyāt* tat kiṃ manyase subhūte
- 4 api nu sā
- 4 strī vā puruṣo vā tatonidānaṃ O bahu puṇyaṃ prasunuyāt* subhūtir āha · bahu bhaga
- 5 van bahu su[gata] : sā strī vā puruṣo vā tatonidānaṃ bahu puṇyaṃ prasunuyāda bhagav[ā]
- 6 n āha · yaś ca khalu punaḥ subhūte tāvaṃtyo lokadhātavaḥ saptaratnapratipūrṇaṃ

13) MS 2385/9; folio 38 recto (Cz 37.5–18)

- 1 kṛtvā dānaṃ dadyāt* yaś ceto dha[r]maparyāyād aṃ[t]aśaś catuṣpadikām api gāthām u
- 2 dgrhya parebhyo deśayet* ayaṃ tato bahutaraṃ puṇyaṃ prameyam asaṃkhyeyam* api
- 3 tu kha[lu] subhūte yasmin pṛthivī[pra]deśe ito dharmaparyāyād aṃtaśaś catuṣpadi
- 4 kām api gāthām bhāṣyeta ○ vā deśyeta vā sa p[r]thivīpradeśaś caityabhūto bha
- 5 ve[t*] sadeva[mā]nu[ṣā]surasya lokasya kaḥ pu[n]ar [v]ādaḥ subhūte ya imaṃ dharmapa
- 6 ryāyaṃ [dhā]rayiṣyānti paramēṇa te āścaryeṇa samanvāgatā bhaviṣyānti · ta

verso (Cz 37.18–38.5)

- 1 smiṃś ca pṛthivīpradeśe śāstā viharaty anyatarānyataro vā gurusthānīyaḥ evam u
- 2 kte āyuṣmān subhūtir bhagavaṃtam ed avocat* ko nāmāyaṃ bhagavan dharmaparyāyaḥ ka
- 3 thaṃ cainaṃ dhārayāmi · evam ukte ○ bhagavān āyuṣmaṃtaṃ subhūtim etad avocat* prajñāpā
- 4 ramitā nāmāya subhūte dharmaparyāyaḥ evaṃ cainaṃ dhāraya : tat kasya hetoḥ yaiva subhū
- 5 prajñāpāramitā tathāgatena bhāṣitā : saivāpāramitā : tat kiṃ manyase subhūte { {anu} }
- 6 api [n]u sa kaści dharmo tathāgatena bhāṣitaḥ subhūtir āha no hīdaṃ bhagavan* bhaga

14) MS 2385/8, uf1/3h; folio 39 recto (Cz 38.5–17; G 5a1–2)

- 1 n āha · na sa kaścid bhagavaṃ ddharmo yaḥ tathāgate bhāṣita yāvataḥ subhūte
- 2 tṛṣāhasramahāsāhasryāṃ lokadhātu pṛthivīrajaḥ kaścit tad bahu bhavet* su
- 3 bhūtir āha · bahu bhagavan*s tat pṛthivīrajo bhavet* yat ta bhagavan* pṛthi
- 4 vīrajaḥ tathāgatena bhāṣitaḥ arajaḥ sa tathāgatena bhāṣitaḥ ta
- 5 d ucyate pṛthivīraja iti · yā sā lokadhātur adhātuḥ sā tathāgatena bhāṣitaḥ
- 6 tad ucyate lokadhātu[r] iti : || bhagavān āha · tat kiṃ manyase subhūte dvātrīṃśadbhir ma

verso (Cz 38.17–39.7; G 5a2–5)

- 1 .āpuruṣalak[ṣ]aṇaiḥ [ta]thāgato rhan samyaksambuddho draṣṭavya · subhūtir āha · no hī
- 2 da[m] bhag[a]vad bhagavān āha · tat kasya hatoḥ yāni tāni bhagavan dvātrīṃśarmahāpuru
- 3 lakṣaṇāni tathāgatena bhāṣi○tāny alakṣaṇāni tagatena bhāṣitāni tasmād u[c]yaṃte dvā
- 4 trīṃśanmahāpuruṣalakṣaṇānī○ti · bhagavān āha · yaś ca khalu punaḥ subhūte strī vā pu
- 5 ruṣo vā gaṃgānadivālukupamān ātmabhāvān parityajet* yaś ceto dharmaparyāyāc catuṣpa
- 6 dikām api gāthām udgrhya parebhyo deśayet* ayaṃ tatonidānaṃ bahutaraṃ puṇyaṃ pra

15) MS 2385/7; folio 40 recto (Cz 39.8–20; G 5a5–7)

- 1 meyam asaṃkhyeyam* atha khalv āyuṣmān subhūtiḥ dharmapravegenāśrūṇi prāmuṃcat*
- 2 pravartayaṃ so śrūṇi parimārjyā bhagavaṃtam etad avocat* āścaryaṃ bhagavan* paramā
- 3 ścaryaṃ sugata : yāvad ayaṃ dharmapa[ry]āyaḥ tathāgatena bhāṣitaḥ yato me bha – –
- 4 gavan* jñānam utpa – – ○ – – [n]naṃ na mayā jātv eva dharmaparyāyaḥ śrutapūrvāḥ
- 5 paramēṇa te bhagavan* – – – – āścaryeṇa samanvāgatā bhaviṣyānti ya iha sū
- 6 t[r]e bh[āṣ]yamāṇe bhū – ta[sa.]jñānam utpādayiṣyānti yā caiśā bhaga[va]n* bhūtasamjñā saivā

verso (Cz 39.20–40.14; G 5a7–5b2)

- 1 samjñā tasmā tathāgato bhāṣate bhūtasamjñā bhūtasamjñeti · na mama bhagavann āścaryam
yad a
- 2 haṃ dharmaparyāyaṃ bhāṣyamāṇam avakalpayāmy adhimucyāmi · ye te bhagavann imaṃ
dharmapa
- 3 ryāyaṃ udgrhīṣyaṃti – – – ○ – – paryavāpsyāṃti dhā..yiṣyaṃti · te paramāścaryasama
- 4 nvāgatā bhaviṣyaṃti · || – – ○ – – api tu khalu punaḥ bhagavan na meṣāṃ āt[ma]samjñā
- 5 pravartsyate · na satvasamjñā na {{ja}}jīvasamjñā · na pudga[lasa]mñā pravartsyate · tat
kasya hato
- 6 yāsāv ātmasamjñā saivāsamjñā yā satvasamjñā jīvasamjñā pudgalasam[jñā s]aivāsamjñā ·
tat ka

16) MS 2385/6; folio 41 recto (Cz 40.14–41.3; G 5b2–4)

- 1 sya hetoḥ sarvasamjñā[p]agatā hi buddhā bhagavaḥ || evam ukte bhagavān ā
- 2 yuṣmaṃtaṃ subhūtim etad avocat* evam etat subhūte evam etat subhūte
- 3 paramāryasamanvāgatās te satvā bha[v]iṣyaṃti[i] · ya iha sūtre bhāṣyaṃmā
- 4 ṇe śrutvā notraṣiṣyaṃti · ○ na samtrasiṣyaṃ[ti] · samtrāsam āpatsyaṃte ta
- 5 t kasya hetoḥ paramapāramiteyaṃ subhūte tathāgatena bhāṣitā yā [c]a
- 6 – – – tathāgataḥ paramapāramitāṃ bhāṣate tām aparimāṃṇā buddhā bha

verso (Cz 41.3–12; G 5b4–6)

- 1 gavamto bhāṣante nocyste paramapāramiteti · api tu khalu punaḥ subhū
- 2 te yā tathāgatasya kṣāṃtipāramitā saivāpāramitā tat kasya hatoḥ yadā
- 3 me su[bhū]te kalimgarājā a[m]Ogapratyaṃgāny a.[che]t[s]in nāsīn me tasmin sama
- 4 ye ātmasamjñā vā satvasamjñā vā jīvasamjñā vā pudgalasamj[n]ā vā na me kā ·
- 5 cit samjñā nāsamjñā babhūva tat kasya hetoḥ [sa]cet subhūte mama tasmin sa
- 6 maye {{ā}}ātmasamjñābhaviṣyat*d vyāpādasamjñāpi me bhaviṣyat* tasmin sa

17) MS 2385/5; folio 42 recto (Cz 41.12–23; G 5b6–7)

- 1 – – maye abhijānāmy ahaṃ subhūte atīte dhvani paṃca jātīsatāni yad a
- 2 haṃ kṣāmtivādīṣi[r a]bhū tadāpi me nātmāsamjñā babhūva · na satvasamjñā
- 3 na jīvasamjñā na pudgalasamjñā · tasmāt ta[rh]i subhūte bodhisatvena mahāsa
- 4 tvena [sa]rvasamjñā vinarjaOyitvānuttarasyāṃ s. .y. [ksa]mbodhau cittam utpāda
- 5 yitavyam* na rūpapraṭiṣṭhitam cittam utpādayitavyam* na śabdaga<<ndha>>rasaspraṣṭa
- 6 vyapraṭiṣṭhitam c[i]ttam utpādayitavyam* na dharmapraṭiṣṭhitam cittam utpādayi

verso (Cz 41.23–42.10)

- 1 tavyam* nādharmapraṭiṣṭhitam cattam utpādayitavyam* na kvacitpraṭiṣṭhitam citta
- 2 m utpādayitavyam* tat kasmād dhetoḥ yat praṭiṣṭhiṃ tad evāpraṭiṣṭhiṃ tasmād evaṃ
- 3 tathāgato bhāṣate rūpāOpraṭiṣṭhitena dānaṃ [dā]tavyam* api tu khalu
- 4 punaḥ subhūte bodhisatvenaivaṃ dānaparityāgaḥ parityajyaḥ sarvasatvānām a
- 5 rthāya yaiva ca satvasamjñā sa evāsamjñā · ya eva te sarvasatvā tathāga
- 6 tena bhāṣitāḥ ta evāsatvāḥ bhūtavādī subhūte tathāgataḥ satyavādī

18) MS 2385/4; folio 43 recto (Cz 42.10–21)

- 1 tathāvādī tathāgato nāvitathāvād[i] tathāgato · api tu khalu punaḥ subhūte yaḥ tathā
- 2 gatena dharmo bhisambuddho deśito vā na tatra satyaṃ na [m]ṛṣā tad yathāpi nāma subhūte
- 3 puruṣo ndhakāraḥ[p]raviṣṭaḥ evaṃ vastupatito [b]o .isatvo draṣṭavya yo vastupatitaṃ dā
- 4 naṃ parityajati · tad yathāpi ○ nāma subhūte cakṣuṣmān* puruṣo .i .ā .āyā rātryā [s]ū
- 5 rye bhyudgate nānāvidhāni rūpāṇ[i] paśyet* evaṃ bodhisatvo draṣṭavyo yo vastvapati
- 6 taṃ dānaṃ parityajati · api tu khalu punaḥ subhūte ye kulaputro vā kuladuhi[t]a

verso (Cz 42.21–43.14)

- 1 ro vā imaṃ dharmaparyāyam udgrahīṣyaṃti : dhāra .. ṣyaṃti · v[ā]c. yiṣyaṃti paryavāpsyamti
· jñā
- 2 tās te subhūte tathāgatena dṛṣ[t]ās te subhūte tathāgatena buddhās te tathāgatena sarve
- 3 te satvāḥ aprameyaṃ puṇya○skandhaṃ prasaviṣyaṃti · yaś ca khalu punaḥ subhūte strī
- 4 vā puruṣo vā pūrvāhṇakālasamaye gaṃgānadīvā[lukop]amān ātmabhāvā[n]* parityaje
- 5 t* madhyāhṇakālasamaye sā – yāhṇakālasamaye gaṃgānadīvālukopamān ā
- 6 tmabhāvā parityajet* anena paryāyeṇa ka[l]pakot[i]nayutaśasahasrāṇy ātmabhā

19) MS 2385/3; folio 44 recto (Cz 43.14–21)

- 1 ----- van* parityajet*d yaś cemaṃ dharmaparyāyaṃ śrutvā ·
- 2 ----- na pratikṣiped ayam eva tatonidānaṃ bahutaraṃ puṇyaskandhaṃ³² pra
- 3 sunuyāt* apra --○-- meyaṃ asaṃkhyeyaṃ* kaḥ punar vādaḥ yo li
- 4 – khitvo ---○ dgrhṇ. yāt*³³ [dh]ārayet* vācayet* paryavāpnu
- 5 yāt* parebhyaś ca vistareṇa saṃprakāśayet* api tu subhūte acimtyo tu
- 6 lyo ya dharmapa -- ryāyaḥ ayaṃ ca [dha]rmaparyāyaḥ tathāgatena bhāṣitaḥ

verso (Cz 43.21–44.6)

- 1 agrayānasamprasthi – tānāṃ sat[v]ānā .. r.ā[ya] · śreṣṭhayānasamprasthitānāṃ satvā
- 2 nām arthāya : – [ya] ye i dhar[m]a[pa]ryāya[m u]dgrahīṣyaṃti · dhārayi[s]yaṃti · vā
- 3 ca – yiṣyati ----○ par[ryā]vāpsyamti³⁴ · jñātās te subhūte tathāgateta
- 4 ----- na dṛṣtās te subhūte tathāgatena sarve te satvāḥ
- 5 aprameyeṇa puṇyaskandhena samanvāgatā [bhavi]ṣyaṃti · acimty[e]nā[t]u[ly]enā
- 6 .. ----- māpyenāparimāṇ[e]na puṇyas[k]an[dh]ena saman[v]āga

20) MS 2385/2, uf1/2n; folio 45 recto (Cz 44.6–16; G 7a1–3)

- 1 tā bhaviṣyaṃti · tat kasya heto · na hi ś. [k]y.. subhūte ayaṃ dharmo hīnādhi[mu] ..i .aiḥ
- 2 śrotum* nātmad[r]ṣṭikāiḥ na satvadrṣṭikāiḥ na jīvad[r]ṣṭikāiḥ na pudgaladrṣṭikāiḥ śa
- 3 kyaṃ śrotum udgrah[i]tuṃ vā dhā○rayituṃ vā vācayituṃ vā paryav[ā]ptu. vā n[e]daṃ
- sthānaṃ vi
- 4 dyate api tu subhūte yatra pṛ[thi]vīpradeśe idaṃ s[ūtra]ṃ prakāśayiṣyati · pūja

³² The anusvāra here is written over the bottom of the subscript *v* of *śrutvā* above.³³ A triangular chip of bark has come away from above the *hṇa*, but the end of the *-ī* can just be made out when the image is magnified.³⁴ The akṣara *ryā* appears to have an *e-mātrā* above it.

5 nīyaḥ sa pṛthivīprad[e]ś[o] bha[viṣya].. ..[d]evamānuṣāsurasya lokasya vanda
verso (Cz 44.16–45.5; G 7a3–5)

- 1 nīyaḥ pradakṣiṇīkadhaṇīyaś ca sa pṛthivīpradeśo bhaviṣyat[i] · c[ai] .[y]. sa pṛthi
- 2 vīpradeśo bhaviṣyati · ye te subhūte kulaputro vā kuladuhitaro vā imān ivaṃrū
- 3 pām sūtrāmtān – – udgrahīṣyaṃOti dhārayiṣyaṃti paryavāpsyāṃti · te pa[r]i[bh]ūtā
bhaviṣyaṃ
- 4 suparibhūtāś ca bhaviṣyaṃti · || yāni teṣāṃ satvānāṃ paurvājanmikāni karmāṇi kṛtāny a
- 5 pāyasaṃvartanīyāni dṛṣṭa eva dharṃe paribhūtatayā pūrvajarṇmi[k]. .. + + .i

21) MS 2385/1, uf1/2a, uf1/2e; folio 46 recto (Cz 45.5–16; G 7a5–7b1)

- 1 karmāṇi kṣapayīṣyati · buddhabodhiṃ ca prāpsyāṃti · abhijānāmy ahaṃ subhūte atīte
- 2 dhvani asaṃkhyeye kalpe asaṃkhyeyatare dī[pa]ṃkarasya tathāgatasyārhatāḥ samyaksaṃ
- 3 buddhasya [p]areṇa parataraṃ caturaśītibuddhakoṭīnayuta[śa]tasahasrāṇy abhū
- 4 van ye mayā ārādhitā ārādhayetvā na virādhitā yac ca mayā subhūte buddhā bhaga
- 5 vaṃtaḥ ārāgitā ārāgaye[tvā] na virāgitā yac ca carime kāle paścime.āyaṃ paṃcā ..
- 6 tyāṃ vartamānāyām imaṃ s. trāṃ[tam]. d... hī[ś].m[t]i dhā[ra] .i ..m .i [v]. + [y]i ..m .[i] +

verso (Cz 45.16–46.11; G 7b1–4)

- 1 ryavāpsyā[m]ti · asya [s]u[bh]ūt. puṇyaska .dh. [s]y. [t]. [kād]. [ś]. [p]ū .[v]. [k] + + + + +
+ + + +
- 2 m api kalā nopaiti sāhasṛtamām a[pi] · śata[sā]hatamām a.[i] · k. t. + + + +
- 3 sṛtamā[m ap]i · saṃkhyām a[p]i ○ [ka]lā[m api] gaṇanām apa upa[mā]m api +
- 4 paṇiśāmate na kṣamate · + + t subhūte te[ś]āṃ kulaputrāṇāṃ ku[lad]uhi .[ṛ] +
- 5 tā puṇyaska[n]dhaṃ bhāṣ[e]t* yāva. taḥ te kula.[utrā vā k]uladuhitā vā tasmin sama[ye] +
- 6 ṇyaskandha pratigṛhṇāmt[i] : unm. [d].[m] te satv[āḥ] prāpnuyuh cittavikṣepaṃ vā gacche..

III. Reconstruction³⁵

§1³⁶; folio 26r1–v4 (Cz 27.1–1)

namo śākyamunar2ye{s}³⁷ tathāgatāyār̥hate samyaksambuddhāya ||³⁸

evaṃ mayā śrutam ekasmin samar3ye³⁹ bhagavān |⁴⁰ śrāvastyāṃ viharati sma | jetavane |⁴¹ anātha-
piṇḍadasyār<ā>me⁴² mahar4tā bhikṣusam̐ghena sārddham ardhatrayodaśabhir bhikṣusataih⁴³ <|> atha
khalu bhagavān r5 pūrvāhṇakālasamaye nivāsyā pātracivaram ādāya | śrāvastīm mahānagarīm
pir6ṇḍāya prāviśat |⁴⁴ atha khalu bhagavān⁴⁵ | śrāvastīm mahānagarī<m> piṇḍāya{m} cariv1tvā⁴⁶
paścādbhaktapiṇḍapātapatikkrāṃtaḥ⁴⁷ pādaḥ prakṣālyā⁴⁸ nyaṣīdad bhagavān⁴⁹ | prajñapta ev2vāsane
paryamkam ābhujya r̥juṃ kāyaṃ praṇidhāya pratimukhaṃ⁵⁰ smṛtim upasthāpya | atha⁵¹ v3 sambahulā

³⁵ Different readings in M, Cz, P, G and the relevant Central Asian fragments (Fragments a, b, d, e, & f) are signalled in the footnotes, except for minor orthographical variants, differences in sandhi or punctuation (unless deemed significant), use of *avagraha*, and so on. We use the terms “add” and “omit” purely formally, to mark words which appear in one edition or ms and not in others, without implying any sequential processes in the development in the text involving actual additions and omissions. Where there are minor orthographical variants between M and Cz, the spelling of M is always the one given (e.g. M’s *abhivam̐dya* stands for Cz’s *abhivandya*). Misprints and minor errors in Cz corrected by Conze on pp. 115–118 are only noted where they form part of variant readings. In the case of P, those words or parts of words reconstructed by Pargiter where there are gaps in the ms or it is illegible appear in parentheses, or, in the case of omissions, are marked by the words “reconstructed” or “apparently.” Such variant readings are of limited use for comparative purposes. That is to say, it is always possible that the missing text agreed with S, and not with M or Cz, and sometimes this is more than likely. A re-edition of P on the basis of S, G and the Central Asian fragments is therefore a desideratum, all the more so since the editorial and typographical conventions employed by Pargiter make it difficult to follow the readings of the ms.

³⁶ Section and subsection divisions throughout are those adopted in the Sanskrit edition by Conze (Cz), which are based on the paragraphing introduced by Max Müller (M).

³⁷ *Śākyamunayes*: the addition of the superfluous -s to the dative is a scribal error which is possibly influenced by the genitive *śākyamunes*, or, according to a suggestion made by Seishi Karashima, may reflect the abnormal genitive form *śākyamunayes tathāgatasyār̥hataḥ samyaksambuddhasya* often found in mss of Mahāyāna sūtras such as the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*. Alternatively, it may simply reflect sandhi applied in error to a punctuation mark subsequently misunderstood as a genuine visarga.

³⁸ This opening salutation differs from those found in M, Cz and the Tibetan translation (hereafter Tib.) M: *namo bhagavatya āryaprajñāpāramitāyai*; Cz: *namo bhagavatya āryaprajñāpāramitāyai*; Tib.: *saṅs rgyas daṅ byaṅ chub sems dpa’ thams cad la phyag ’tshal lo*. (Conze gives no justification for reading *bhagavatya*). According to the notes in M, J has *Namaḥ sarvajñāya* (“Hail to the Omniscient One!”).

Among the seven Chinese translations, only that by Dharmagupta (?–619) has an opening salutation, as follows: “I take refuge in all the oceans of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas.” 歸命一切佛菩薩海等 (T. 238, 766c15; note that in this translation *deng* 等 renders Sanskrit plurals). It is thus close to Tib.

³⁹ Cz and Tib. punctuate after *samaye*, while M and all Chinese translations break the line after *śrutam* (Ch: 如是我聞。一時...).

⁴⁰ S frequently punctuates after words like *bhagavant* and *sugata* using virāma or the two dots also used to write the visarga. We preserve this “honorific” punctuation.

⁴¹ This punctuation not found in Cz and M, which read: *jetavane ’nātha°*.

⁴² S reads: *anāthapiṇḍadasyārame*.

⁴³ M, Cz add: *sambahulaiś ca bodhisattvair mahāsattvaiḥ*, Tib. adds: *byaṅ chub sems dpa’ sems dpa’ chen po rab tu maṅ po dag daṅ*. All Chinese translations lack this phrase, except for that by Yijing 義淨, which has 及大菩薩眾.

⁴⁴ Wherever virāma occurs (which in this ms incorporates the standard punctuation mark, like a horizontal comma), we place a daṇḍa in the Reconstruction, without enclosing it in pointed brackets, so as to make it clear that the punctuation is that of the ms, and not our own imposition.

⁴⁵ S reads *bhagavan*.

⁴⁶ M, Cz add: *kṛtabhaktakṛtyaḥ*.

⁴⁷ M, Cz add: *pātracivaram pratiśāmya*.

⁴⁸ M, Cz: *prakṣālyā*.

⁴⁹ M, Cz read *nyaṣīdat*, omitting *bhagavān* (but M notes that Ch & T read *nyaṣīdad bhagavān*).

⁵⁰ M, Cz: *pratimukhīm* (but M notes that J reads *abhimukhām*).

bhikṣavaḥ yena bhagavāms tenopasaṃkkraman upasaṃkkramya bhagavataḥ v4 pādaś śirasābhivandya⁵² bhagavaṃtaṃ trīṣṭadakṣiṇīkṛtvā <e>kāṃte⁵³ nyaṣīdan |

§2; folio 26v4–27v6 (Cz 27.16–28.17; P 179.14–24)

tena khalu puṣṇaḥ samayenāyusmān subhūtiḥ tasyāṃ eva pariṣadi⁵⁴ sannipatito 'bhūt sannipannaḥ
<|> v6 atha khalv āyusmān subhūtir utth{y}āyāsanād ekāṃsam uttarāsaṃgaṃ kṛtvā dakṣiṇaṃ
jā27r1n{n}umaṇḍalaṃ pṛthivyāṃ pratiṣṭhāpya yena bhagavāms tenāṃjalim praṇāmya⁵⁵ bhagavaṃ-
tam e⁵⁶tad ar2vocat | āścaryaṃ bhagavan⁵⁷ yāvad eva{n}⁵⁸ tathāgatenārhatā samyaksaṃbuddhena⁵⁹
bodhisatvā mar3hāsattvā⁶⁰ anupariḡhītāḥ paramēṇānugraheṇa |⁶¹ yāvad eva tathāgatena⁶² bor4dhi-
sattvāḥ⁶³ parittāḥ⁶⁴ paramayā parindanayā⁶⁵ | kathaṃ⁶⁶ bhagava<n> bodhisattvayār5nasamprasthitena⁶⁷
sthātavyam | kathaṃ pratipatta{pa}vyam⁶⁸ | ka{m}tham cittam pratir6ḡhītavyam⁶⁹ | evam ukte
bhagavān āyusmaṃtaṃ subhūtim etad av(o)c(a)t⁷⁰ | sādhu v1 sādhu subhūte evam etat subhūte⁷¹
anupariḡhītās tathāgatena bodhisat(v)ā(h⁷² para)v2meṇānugraheṇa | parittās⁷³ tathāgatena bodhi-
sattvāḥ⁷⁴ v3 paramayānuparindanayā⁷⁵ | tena hi subhūte śṛṇu sādhu v4 ca suṣṭhu ca manasikuru
bhāṣiṣye⁷⁶ | yathā bodhisattvayānasamprasthitena sthātavyam | v5 yathā pratipattavyam⁷⁷ | yathā
cittam pratirḡhītavyam⁷⁸ | evaṃ bhagavann⁷⁹ i(ty āyu)smān subhūtiḥ v6r bhagava{m}taḥ pratyāśrauṣīt |

§3; folio 27v6–28v1 (Cz 28.17–29.7; P 179.24–180.10)

bhagavāms tān etad avocat⁸⁰ | iha subhūte bodhisattvayāna28r1{na}samprasthitair⁸¹ evaṃ⁸² cittam

⁵¹ M, Cz add: *khalu*.

⁵² M, Cz: *śīrobhir abhivaṃdya*.

⁵³ M, Cz: *trīṣṭadakṣiṇīkṛtyaikāṃte*.

⁵⁴ M, Cz: *parṣadi*.

⁵⁵ M, Cz: *pranāmya*.

⁵⁶ P begins here (fol. 2r1).

⁵⁷ P: *bhagavā*; M, Cz add: *paramāścaryaṃ sugata* after *bhagavan*.

⁵⁸ The reading *eva* is confirmed by the parallel wording at 27r3, also P, M, Cz.

⁵⁹ P omits: *arhatā samyaksaṃbuddhena*.

⁶⁰ P omits: *mahāsattvāḥ*.

⁶¹ M, Cz add: *āścaryaṃ bhagavan*.

⁶² M, Cz add: *arhatā samyaksaṃbuddhena*.

⁶³ M, Cz add: *mahāsattvaḥ*.

⁶⁴ M, Cz: *parīṇditāḥ*, P: *parinditāḥ*.

⁶⁵ M, Cz: *parīṇdanayā*; P: *(parinda)nayā*.

⁶⁶ M, Cz, P: *tat kathaṃ*.

⁶⁷ M, Cz add: *kulaputrena vā kuladuhitrā vā*.

⁶⁸ P omits: *kathaṃ pratipattavyam*.

⁶⁹ M, Cz: *pragrahītavyam*; P: *pra(grahe)ṭavyam*.

⁷⁰ P apparently omits: *evam ukte bhagavān āyusmaṃtaṃ subhūtim etad avocat*.

⁷¹ P omits: *evam etat subhūte*. M, Cz omit: *subhūte* and add: *yathā vadasi*.

⁷² M, Cz add: *mahāsattvāḥ*.

⁷³ M, Cz: *parīṇditās*, P: *parinditās*.

⁷⁴ M, Cz add: *mahāsattvāḥ*.

⁷⁵ M, Cz: *parīṇdanayā*; P: *parindanayā*.

⁷⁶ M, Cz add: *'haṃ te*.

⁷⁷ P apparently omits: *yathā pratipattavyam*.

⁷⁸ M, Cz: *pragrahītavyam*; P: *(pragrahe)ṭavyam*.

⁷⁹ S reads: *bhagavān* (so too P).

⁸⁰ M: *bhagavān asyaitad avocat* (with note: *bhagavān etad avocat* J.; no MS. has *asmai tad*^o) ; Cz: *bhagavān etad*

utpādayitavyam | yāvaṃtaḥ⁸³ satvāḥ⁸⁴ satvasaṃgrahena saṃgrhīṭāḥ⁸⁵ aṇḍajā vā jarāyujā vā saṃsvedajā vā upapādukā⁸⁶ vā rūpiṇo vā arūpiṇo r3 vā {a}saṃjñino vā asaṃjñino vā naiva saṃjñino nāsaṃjñinaḥ⁸⁷ yāvat satvadhātuh prajñar4pyamānaḥ prajñāpya{m}te⁸⁸ te⁸⁹ mayā sarve anupadhiśeṣe nirvāṇadhātau parir5ni<rvā>payitavyāḥ <|> evaṃ aparimāṇāṃs ca⁹⁰ satvān {||} parini<r>vāpayitavyāḥ⁹¹ na ca⁹² kaścīt satva<h> r6 parinirvāpito bhavati | tat kasmād dhetoḥ⁹³ <|> sacet subhūte bodhisatvasya satvasaṃjñā⁹⁴ r7 pravartate⁹⁵ na sa bodhisatva iti vaktavyaḥ⁹⁶ <|> tat kasya hetoḥ <|> na sa⁹⁷ subhūte bodhisav1tvo vaktavyo⁹⁸ yasya satvasaṃjñā pravarteta⁹⁹ jīvasaṃjñā vā pudgalasaṃjñā vā pravarteta¹⁰⁰ <|>

§4; folio 28v1–29r5 (Cz 29.8–30.5; P 180.10–15)

api tu v2 khalu punaḥ¹⁰¹ subhūte bodhisatvena <na va>stupratīṣṭhitena¹⁰² dānaṃ dātavyam | na kvacitpratīṣṭhitena dāv3naṃ <dā>tavyam | na rūpapratīṣṭhitena dānaṃ dātavyaṃ¹⁰³ na śabdagandharasapraṣṭavyeṣu na dharmaprativ4ṣṭhitena¹⁰⁴ dānaṃ dātavyam | evaṃ hi subhūte bodhisatvena¹⁰⁵ dānaṃ dātavyam | yathā na nimiv5ttasaṃjñāyāṃ¹⁰⁶ prati<ti>ṣṭhet¹⁰⁷ | tat kasya hetoḥ <|> yaḥ subhūte bodhisatvaḥ¹⁰⁸ apratīṣṭhito dānaṃ v6 dadāti¹⁰⁹ (ta)sya subh(ū)te puṇyaskandhasya na sukaraṃ

avocat; P: bhagavān avocat.

⁸¹ M, Cz: °samprasthitena; P apparently reads: bodhi(satvena).

⁸² P apparently omits: evaṃ.

⁸³ M, Cz add: subhūte.

⁸⁴ M, Cz add: sattvadhātau.

⁸⁵ P omits: satvasaṃgrahena saṃgrhīṭāḥ.

⁸⁶ S reads: ūpapādukā. M, Cz: vaupapādukā.

⁸⁷ M, Cz: naiva saṃjñino nāsaṃjñino vā; P: naiva saṃjñānopakā vā.

⁸⁸ M, Cz: yāvān (Cz: yāvan) kaścīt sattvadhātur (Cz: °dhātu, corrected to °dhātur on p. 116) prajñāpyamānaḥ prajñāpyate (sing.); P: yāvaṃtaḥ satvāḥ prajñāpyamānāḥ prajñāpyante (pl.). Here we regard the pl. prajñāpyante of S as an error possibly caused by the following te, and emend to sing.

⁸⁹ M, Cz add: ca.

⁹⁰ M, Cz: aparimāṇān (C: aparimāṇan, corrected on p. 116) api; P: aparimāṇāṃ ca.

⁹¹ M, Cz: parinirvāpya, P: parinirvāpayitvā.

⁹² M, Cz, P omit: ca.

⁹³ M, Cz, P: tat kasya hetoḥ.

⁹⁴ P: satvasaṃjñā hi subhūte bodhisatvasya for sacet subhūte bodhisatvasya satvasaṃjñā.

⁹⁵ M, Cz, P: pravarteta.

⁹⁶ S reads: naktavyaḥ.

⁹⁷ S reads: su. P omits: sa.

⁹⁸ P omits: vaktavyo.

⁹⁹ M: yasya sattvasaṃjñā pravarteta (with note indicating that Ch & T read: yasyāttmasaṃjñā satvasaṃjñā pravarteta); Cz, P: yasyāttmasaṃjñā pravarteta sattvasaṃjñā vā. M thus reads with S and Tib.: gaṇ sems can du 'du śes 'jug gam | srog tu 'du śes sam | gaṇ zag tu 'du śes 'jug na.

¹⁰⁰ P omits: pravarteta.

¹⁰¹ P omits: khalu punaḥ.

¹⁰² M, Cz: na bodhisattvena vastupratīṣṭhitena; P: bodhisatvenāvastupratipattito; cf. Tib.: byaṅ chub sems dpas dños po la mi gnas par.

¹⁰³ P apparently omits: na rūpapratīṣṭhitena dānaṃ dātavyaṃ, but the reading of the ms is not absolutely clear, and what Pargiter has as na kva(cit pra)ti° may well be na rūpapra°ti°. If not, the following na śabdagandharasa° is difficult to explain.

¹⁰⁴ M, Cz: °spraṣṭavyadharmeṣu pratīṣṭhitena for °spraṣṭavyeṣu na dharmapratīṣṭhitena; P: °spraṣṭavyeṣu pratīṣṭhihitvā.

¹⁰⁵ M, Cz insert: mahāsattvena.

¹⁰⁶ M, Cz insert: api; P: saṃjñāyā.

¹⁰⁷ M, Cz: pratīṣṭhet; P: pratīṣṭhihe.

¹⁰⁸ Cz omits: bodhisattvaḥ.

pramāṇam udgrahītum | tat kiṃ manyase suv7bh(ū)te sukaram (pū)rv(a)syāṃ diśi ākāśasya pramāṇam udgrahītum | subhūtir¹¹⁰ āha | 29r1 no hīdaṃ bhagavan¹¹¹ | evaṃ dakṣiṇapaścimottarā<sv adha> ūrdhvaṃ¹¹² vidikṣu-r-avidikṣu |¹¹³ daśasu dikṣu |¹¹⁴ sur2karam ākāśasya pramāṇam udgrahītum | subhūtir āha | na¹¹⁵ hīdaṃ bhagavan | (bhagavān) ār3ha | evaṃ eta<t>¹¹⁶ subhūte | evaṃ etat subhūte¹¹⁷ yo bodhisatvo 'pratiṣṭhito dānaṃ r4 dadāti tasya¹¹⁸ puṇyaskandhasya na sukaram pramāṇam udgrahītum |¹¹⁹ api tu khalu r5 punaḥ subhūte evaṃ bodhisatvena dānamayaṃ puṇyakṛyāvastuṃ dānaṃ dātavyam¹²⁰ |

§5; folio 29r5–v4 (Cz 30.6–14)

tat kiṃ r6 manyase subhūte tathāgato lakṣaṇasāmpadā¹²¹ draṣṭavyaḥ <|> bhagavān¹²² āha¹²³ na lakṣaṇav1sāmpadā tathāgato¹²⁴ draṣṭavyaḥ <|> tat kasya hetoḥ <|> yā sā¹²⁵ tathāgatena lakṣaṇasāmpad¹²⁶ bhāṣiv2tā{h} saivālakṣaṇasāmpa{dā}t | evaṃ ukte bhagavān āyusmaṃtaṃ subhūtim etad avocat | y<ā>v3vat su<bhū>te lakṣaṇaṃ¹²⁷ tāvan mṛṣā | yāvad alakṣaṇaṃ¹²⁸ tāvad amṛṣā <|> iti¹²⁹ hi lakṣaṇālakṣaṇataḥ v4 tathāgato draṣṭavyaḥ ||

§6; folio 29v4–31v6 (Cz 30.15–32.5)

evaṃ ukte āyusmān subhūti<r> bhagavaṃtaṃ etad avocat | av5sti bhagavan kecit satvāḥ bhaviṣyaṃty anāgate 'dhvani¹³⁰ paścimāyāṃ paṃcāśatyā<m>¹³¹ vartamānāv6yām¹³² ye imeṣv eva<m>rūpeṣu

¹⁰⁹ End of fol. 2 in P. Fols. 3–5 of P are missing.

¹¹⁰ S reads: *subhūter*.

¹¹¹ M, Cz insert: *bhagavān āha*.

¹¹² M: *dakṣiṇapaścimottarāsv adha ūrdhvaṃ*. Cz has: *dakṣiṇa-pāścima-uttara-āsvadha-ūrdhvaṃ*, either through misconstruing the wording of M or because of a misprint, but corrects on p. 116. We restore (*paścimottarā*)*sv adha*, otherwise the long *a* is difficult to understand.

¹¹³ M, Cz: *digvidikṣu samantād* for *vidikṣu-r-avidikṣuḥ*. We take the *-r-* here as hiatus-bridger, but it may well reflect sandhi applied to a visarga originally used as punctuation (cf. next note).

¹¹⁴ M, Cz: *daśasu dikṣu*. Note the use of *visarga* here as punctuation, represented by a danda in our reconstruction.

¹¹⁵ M, Cz: *no*.

¹¹⁶ M, Cz: *evaṃ eva*. This seems the more likely reading in the context (in which a comparison is being made), but the repeated *evaṃ etat* of S is in fact reflected in three of the Chinese translations (Bo, Dh, Xu).

¹¹⁷ M, Cz omit: *evaṃ etat subhūte*.

¹¹⁸ M, Cz insert: *subhūte*.

¹¹⁹ This sentence quoted in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (ed. Bendall, p. 275) in exactly the same form: *yathoktaṃ vajracchedikāyāṃ / yo bodhisatvo 'pratiṣṭhito dānaṃ dadāti / tasya puṇyaskandhasya na sukaram pramāṇam udgrahītum iti* |.

¹²⁰ M, Cz: *evaṃ hi subhūte bodhisattvayānasamprasthitena dānaṃ dātavyaṃ yathā na nimittasamjñāyāṃ api pratitiṣṭhet* for *api tu khalu punaḥ subhūte evaṃ bodhisatvena dānamayaṃ puṇyakṛyāvastuṃ dānaṃ dātavyam*. Tib. omits this sentence.

¹²¹ M, Cz: *lakṣaṇasāmpadā tathāgato* (with misprint in M: *tathāgatā*).

¹²² M, Cz: *subhūtir* for *bhagavān*.

¹²³ M, Cz insert: *no hīdaṃ bhagavan*.

¹²⁴ Frag a begins here (with *-to*).

¹²⁵ M, Cz insert: *bhagavan*. Frag a reads with S.

¹²⁶ M, Cz: *lakṣaṇasāmpat tathāgatena* for *tathāgatena lakṣaṇasāmpad*; Frag a: *lakṣaṇasāmpat tathāga*///.

¹²⁷ M, Cz: *lakṣaṇasāmpat* for *lakṣaṇaṃ*.

¹²⁸ M, Cz: *alakṣaṇasāmpat* for *alakṣaṇaṃ*. Frag a appears to read with M, Cz.

¹²⁹ M, Cz: *na mṛṣeti*, Frag a: *na mṛṣā / iti* for *amṛṣā </> iti*. Frag a, however, supports the implicit punctuation of S.

¹³⁰ M, Cz add: *paścime kāle paścime samaye*. Cf. Tib., which lacks the equivalent of this phrase. Missing in Frag a.

¹³¹ M, Cz: *paṃcāśatyām* (but M notes that Ch, J, T read: *paṃcāśatyām*). Frag a has only *śatyām* at beginning of line v5.

¹³² M, Cz: *saddharmavipralopakāle vartamāne*, Frag a: *saddharmavipralope varttamāne* for *vartamānāyām*. Cf. Tib.:

sūtrāntapadeṣu bhāṣyamāṇeṣu bhūtasamjñām utpā³⁰r1dayiṣyamti | bhagavān āha | mā tvam subhūte¹³³
 <e>vam vocat¹³⁴ | a(sti) kecit satvāḥ bhaviṣya<m>r2ty anāgate 'dhvani¹³⁵ ye imeṣv evamrūpeṣu
 sūtrāntapadeṣu bhāṣyamāṇeṣu bhūtasamr3jñām utpādayiṣyamti | api tu khalu punaḥ subhūte
 bhaviṣyamty anāgate 'dhvani bor4dhisatvā mahāsattvā¹³⁶ paścimāyām pañcāśatyām¹³⁷ saddharma-
 vipralope r5 {pe} vartamāne śīlavamto guṇavamtaḥ¹³⁸ prajñāva<m>to¹³⁹ bhaviṣyamti | ¹⁴⁰ na khalu
 pur6naḥ¹⁴¹ subhūte bodhisattvā¹⁴² ekabuddhaparyupāsītā bhaviṣyamti¹⁴³ | v1 naikabuddhavaropita-
 kuśalamūlā¹⁴⁴ bhaviṣyamti | api tu khalu v2 punaḥ subhūte anekabuddhaparyupāsītā¹⁴⁵ bhaviṣyamv3ti¹⁴⁶
 anekabuddhavaropitakuśalamūlā¹⁴⁷ bhaviṣyamti | v4 ye imeṣv eva<m>rūpeṣu sūtrā<m>tapadeṣu
 bhāṣyamāṇeṣv ekacittaprasāda⁵mātram¹⁴⁸ api pratilapsyamte | jñātās te subhūte tathāgatena¹⁴⁹ drṣṭās
 te subhūv6te tathāgatena¹⁵⁰ sarve te¹⁵¹ aprameyam¹⁵² puṇyaskamdhām 31r1 prasaviṣyamti
 pratigrhīṣyamti <|> tat kasya hetoḥ <|> na hi teṣā<m> subhūte¹⁵³ bodhisar2tvānām¹⁵⁴ ātmasamjñā
 pravartsyate¹⁵⁵ na satvasam<jñā> na jīvasamjñā na pudgalasamjñā pravartsyate¹⁵⁶ | r3 nāpi teṣām
 subhūte bodhisattvānām¹⁵⁷ dharmasamjñā pravart4rtsyate¹⁵⁸ nādharmasamjñā nāpi teṣām¹⁵⁹ samjñā
 nāsamjñā pravartsyate¹⁶⁰ | r5 tat kasya hetoḥ <|> sace<t> subhūte teṣām bodhir6sattvānā(m)¹⁶¹ dharma-

dam pa'i chos rab tu rnam par 'jig par 'gyur ba na.

¹³³ M, Cz, Frag a: *subhūte tvam* for *tvam subhūte*.

¹³⁴ M, Cz: *vocaḥ*. The anomalous *vocat* of S may be the result of confusion between visarga and -t*, and should probably be emended to *vocaḥ*. Frag a line r1 ends with *vo-*.

¹³⁵ M, Cz add: *paścime kāle paścime samaye paścimāyām pañcāśatyām saddharmavipralope vartamāne*, Frag a (beginning of line r2): *ścimāyām pañcāśatyām saddharmavipralope varttamāne*. Cf. Tib.: *lha brgya tha ma la dam pa'i chos rab tu rnam par 'jig par 'gyur ba na*.

¹³⁶ M, Cz add: *paścime kāle paścime samaye*. Frag a reads with S.

¹³⁷ M, Cz: *pañcāśatyām*. Frag a reads with S. Cf. Tib.: *lha brgya tha ma la*.

¹³⁸ M, Cz: *guṇavamtaḥ śīlavamtaḥ* for *śīlavamto guṇavamtaḥ*. Missing in Frag a.

¹³⁹ M, Cz: *prajñāvantaś ca* (Cz: *prajñāvantaś ca*, corrected p. 116). Missing in Frag a.

¹⁴⁰ M, Cz add: *ya imeṣv evamrūpeṣu sūtrāntapadeṣu bhāṣyamāṇeṣu bhūtasamjñām* (Cz: *bhūtasamjñām*, corrected p. 116) *utpādayiṣyamti*. Cf. Tib., which adds: [*sems can gañ la la dag*] 'di lta bu'i mdo sde'i tshig bsad pa 'di la yañ dag par 'du šes (b)skyed par 'gyur ba. Frag a cannot have read with M & Cz, and probably read with S, if one goes by the number of missing akṣaras.

¹⁴¹ M, Cz, Frag a add: *te*.

¹⁴² M, Cz add: *mahāsattvā*. Frag a reads with S.

¹⁴³ Frag a breaks off here.

¹⁴⁴ S reads: *naikabuddhavaropita°*.

¹⁴⁵ M, Cz: *anekabuddhaśatasahasraparyupāsītā*.

¹⁴⁶ M, Cz omit: *bhaviṣyamti*.

¹⁴⁷ M, Cz: *anekabuddhaśatasahasrāvaropitakuśalamūlās te bodhisattvā mahāsattvā* for *anekabuddhavaropitakuśalamūlā*.

¹⁴⁸ M, Cz: *ekacittaprasādam* for *ekacittaprasādamātram*, but Tib. adds *tsam* (*mātra*).

¹⁴⁹ M, Cz add: *buddhajñānena*. There is no equivalent for *buddhajñānena* in Tib.

¹⁵⁰ M, Cz add: *buddhacakṣuṣā buddhās te subhūte tathāgatena*.

¹⁵¹ M, Cz add: *subhūte*.

¹⁵² S reads: *aprameye* (note that *e-mātrā* and *anusvāra* are easily confused); M, Cz add: *asamkhyeyam*.

¹⁵³ M, Cz: *subhūte teṣām* for *teṣām subhūte*.

¹⁵⁴ M, Cz add: *mahāsattvānām*.

¹⁵⁵ M, Cz: *pravartate*.

¹⁵⁶ M, Cz: *pravartate*.

¹⁵⁷ M, Cz add: *mahāsattvānām*.

¹⁵⁸ M, Cz: *pravartate* / *evam*.

¹⁵⁹ M, Cz add: *subhūte*.

¹⁶⁰ M, Cz: *pravartate*.

¹⁶¹ M, Cz add: *mahāsattvānām*.

saṃjñā prav(a)<r>tsyate¹⁶² sa eva teṣām ātmagrāv¹⁶³ho bhavet | satvagrāho jī(v)a(g)r(ā)h(aḥ¹⁶³ pudgala-
grā)ho bhavet | sav²ced¹⁶⁴ <a>dharmaśaṃjñā¹⁶⁵ pravarteta sa eva teṣā(m ātmagrāh)o bhavet | satva-
grāv³ho jīvagrāhaḥ pudgalagrāha iti (| ta)t (ka)sya hetoḥ <|> na khalu puna<h> v⁴ subhūte¹⁶⁶
dharmodgrahītavyo nādharmā<h> <|> tasmād (i)da(m) saṃndhāya tathāgatena v⁵ bhāṣitaṃ¹⁶⁷
kolopamaṃ dharmaparyāyaṃ ājānadbhiḥ dharmāḥ eva prahātavyāḥ prāg ev⁶vādharmāḥ¹⁶⁸ ||

§7; folio 31v6–32v1 (Cz 32.6–33.2)

punar aparaṃ bhagavān āyusmaṃtaṃ subhūtim etad avocat¹⁶⁹ | tat ki<m> 32r1 manyase subhūte
kācit¹⁷⁰ tathāgatenānuttarā{m} samyaksambodhir¹⁷¹ abhisambuddhā¹⁷² kaścīr²d vā dharmas tathā-
gatena deśitaḥ || subhūtir āha¹⁷³ | yathāhaṃ bhagavan bhagavato r³ bhāṣitasyārtham ājānāmi nāsti
sa kaścīd dha(r)m(o ya)s tathāgatenānuttarā{m} r⁴ samyaksambodhir¹⁷⁴ abhisambuddhā¹⁷⁵ | nāsti sa
kaścīd¹⁷⁶ dharmo y(as tathā)g(at)ena deśitaḥ <|> tar⁵t kasya hetoḥ <|> yo 'sau tathāgatena dharmo¹⁷⁷
deśit(aḥ¹⁷⁸ | agrāhyaḥ s)o 'nabhiḥapyāḥ¹⁷⁹ <|> v¹ na sa dharmo nādharmāḥ <|> tat kasya hetoḥ <|>
asaṃskṛtaprabhāvitā¹⁸⁰ hy āryapudgalāḥ <|>

§8; folio 32v1–34r1 (Cz 33.3–26)

¹⁸¹tat kiṃ mav²nyase subhūte ya¹⁸² imāṃ¹⁸³ trisāhasramahāsāhasr(āṃ)¹⁸⁴ lokadhātum saptaratnaprati-
pūv³rṇaṃ¹⁸⁵ kṛtvā¹⁸⁶ dānaṃ dadyāt | tat kiṃ manyase subhūte¹⁸⁷ api nu sa kulaputro vā kulav⁴duhitā

¹⁶² M, Cz: pravarteta.

¹⁶³ S appears to have read: jīvagrāhaḥ.

¹⁶⁴ S reads: sacad.

¹⁶⁵ S reads: dharmasamjñā, as do Ch & T according to M. Frag d begins here with + [dh](a)rm(a)samjñā.

¹⁶⁶ M, Cz add: bodhisattvena mahāsattvena. Frag d, although much text is lost, appears to diverge markedly: /// [ho] bhavet* : yataḥ na dharmā udgrhī. In view of the number of akṣaras missing (approx. 24–29), it may originally have read: s(a eva teṣām ātmagrāho bhavet* satvagrāv³ho jīvagrāhaḥ pudgalagrā)ho bhavet* yataḥ na dharmā udgrahī(tavyā nādharmāḥ).

¹⁶⁷ M, Cz: iyaṃ tathāgatena saṃndhāya vāg bhāṣitā for idaṃ saṃndhāya tathāgatena bhāṣitaṃ (but see n. 5 in M for the variant readings of his witnesses and the basis on which he has “tried to restore the original text”). Frag d missing.

¹⁶⁸ M, Cz add: iti. Frag d missing.

¹⁶⁹ The number of missing akṣaras in Frag d make it likely that it did not contain this sentence.

¹⁷⁰ M, Cz: asti sa kaścīd dharmo yas for kācit. Frag d missing.

¹⁷¹ M, Cz add: ity (but M notes that Ch, J & T lack this). Frag d missing.

¹⁷² M, Cz: abhisambuddhaḥ (to agree with kaścīd dharmo, but M notes that J also reads abhisambuddhā). Frag d missing.

¹⁷³ M, Cz: evam ukta āyusmān subhūtir bhagavaṃtaṃ etad avocat for subhūtir āha. Frag d missing.

¹⁷⁴ M, Cz add: ity (M notes that J lacks this). Frag d reads with S.

¹⁷⁵ M, Cz: abhisambuddhaḥ. It is not clear whether S should be emended to this as well. Frag d with S: abhisambuddhā.

¹⁷⁶ M, Cz omit: sa kaścīd. Frag d reads with S.

¹⁷⁷ M, Cz add: 'bhisambuddho. Frag d reads with S.

¹⁷⁸ M, Cz: deśito vā. Frag d (deśita agrāhya) supports our reconstruction of S, in which what can be seen of the missing akṣaras renders deśito impossible.

¹⁷⁹ Frag d: agrāhya sau anabhiḥ.

¹⁸⁰ S reads: asaṃskṛtathābhāvitā. This scribal error is accounted for by the close resemblance of the akṣaras pra and thā.

¹⁸¹ M, Cz add: bhagavān āha. Frag d reads with S.

¹⁸² Frag d breaks off here.

¹⁸³ Cz: yaḥ kaścīd kulaputro vā kuladuhitāvēmaṃ for ya imāṃ.

¹⁸⁴ M, Cz: trisāhasra°. Hereafter this orthographical variant not noted. M, Cz: °mahāsāhasraṃ. Reconstructed as feminine in S on the basis of 33r4.

¹⁸⁵ M, Cz: °paripūrṇaṃ.

vā tatonidānaṃ bahu¹⁸⁸ puṇyaṃ¹⁸⁹ prasunuyāt | subhūtir āha | bahu bhagavav5n bahu sugata |¹⁹⁰ sa kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā tatonidān(a)ṃ bahu¹⁹¹ puṇyaṃ¹⁹² (pra)33r1sunuyāt¹⁹³ <|> tat kasya hetoḥ <|> sa eva bhagavann askandhaḥ¹⁹⁴ <|> (tas)m(ā)t tathāgar2to bhāṣate puṇyaskandhaḥ askandha¹⁹⁵ iti {bhagavan} bhagavān āha | yaś ca r3 khalu punaḥ subhūte kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā imāṃ r4 ṛṣāhasrāmāhāsāhasrām¹⁹⁶ lokadhātum saptaratnapratipūr5rṇaṃ¹⁹⁷ kṛtvā¹⁹⁸ dānaṃ dad<y>āt¹⁹⁹ | yaś ceto dharmaparyāyad aṃtaśaś catuv1ṣpadikām²⁰⁰ api gāthām udgrhya parebhyo²⁰¹ deśayet samprakāśayed ayav2m eva tatonidānaṃ bahutaraṃ puṇyaṃ²⁰² prasunuyāt | aprameyam asaṃv3khyeyaṃ <|> tat kasya hetoḥ <|> ato nirjātā hi subhūte tathāgatāv4nām²⁰³ anuttarā samyaksambodhiḥ <|> ato nirjātāś ca buddhā bhagava<m>taḥ <|> v5 tat kasmād dhetoḥ²⁰⁴ <|> buddhadharmāḥ buddhadharmā iti subhūte abuddhadharmā34r1ś caiva te²⁰⁵ |

§9a; folio 34r1–5 (Cz 33.26–34.11)

tat kiṃ manyase subhūte | api nu srotāpannasya evaṃ bhavati r2 mayā srotāpattiphalaṃ prāptam iti | subhūtir āha | no hīdaṃ bhagavar3n²⁰⁶ <|> bhagavān āha²⁰⁷ | tat kasya hetoḥ <|> na hi sa bhagavan kiṃcid²⁰⁸ āpanna<h> |> ter4nocyate srotāpanna iti | na rūpaṃ āpanno na śabdā<n> na gandhā<n> na rasār5n na spraṣṭavyān na²⁰⁹ dharmān āpannaḥ <|> tenocyate²¹⁰ srotāpanna iti²¹¹ |

§9b; folio 34v1–35r1 (Cz 34.12–18)

v1 bhagavān āha | tat kiṃ manyase subhūte api nu sakṛdāgāmināḥ v2 evaṃ bhaven²¹² mayā sakṛdā-

¹⁸⁶ M, Cz add: *tathāgatebhyo 'rhadbhyah samyaksambuddhebhyo*.

¹⁸⁷ M, Cz omit: *tat kiṃ manyase subhūte*.

¹⁸⁸ Cz: *bahutaraṃ* (citing reading of Ch & T reported by M).

¹⁸⁹ M, Cz: *puṇyaskandhaṃ*.

¹⁹⁰ *Visarga* is used as punctuation after *sugata* in §§8, 10c, 11 and 14a.

¹⁹¹ M, Cz omit: *bahu*.

¹⁹² M, Cz: *puṇyaskandhaṃ*.

¹⁹³ S reads: *prasunuyāh*.

¹⁹⁴ M, Cz: *yo 'sau bhagavan puṇyaskandhas tathāgatena bhāṣitaḥ askandhaḥ sa tathāgatena bhāṣitaḥ* for *sa eva bhagavann askandhaḥ*.

¹⁹⁵ M, Cz: *puṇyaskandha* for *askandha*.

¹⁹⁶ M, Cz: *imaṃ trisāhasramahāsāhasraṃ*.

¹⁹⁷ M, Cz: *°paripūrṇaṃ*.

¹⁹⁸ M, Cz add: *tathāgatebhyo 'rhadbhyah samyaksambuddhebhyo*.

¹⁹⁹ M, Cz: *dadyāt*.

²⁰⁰ M, Cz: *catuṣpādikām*. Cf. *BHSD*, p. 223.

²⁰¹ M, Cz add: *vistareṇa*.

²⁰² M, Cz: *puṇyaskandhaṃ*.

²⁰³ M, Cz add: *arhatāṃ samyaksambuddhānām*.

²⁰⁴ M, Cz: *tat kasya hetoḥ*.

²⁰⁵ M, Cz add: *tathāgatena bhāṣitaḥ tenocyante buddhadharmā iti*.

²⁰⁶ M, Cz add: *na srotāpannasyaivaṃ bhavati mayā srotāpattiphalaṃ prāptam iti*.

²⁰⁷ M, Cz omit: *bhagavān āha*.

²⁰⁸ M, Cz: *kaṃcid dharmam* for *kiṃcid*.

²⁰⁹ M omits: *na*.

²¹⁰ S reads: *tanocyate*.

²¹¹ M, Cz add: *saced bhagavan srotāpannasyaivaṃ bhaven mayā srotāpattiphalaṃ prāptam iti sa eva tasyātmagrāho bhavet sattvagrāho jīvaṅgrāhaḥ pudgalagrāho bhaved iti*.

²¹² M, Cz: *bhavati* for *bhaven*.

gāmiphalaṃ prāptam iti | subhūtir āha | no hīvaḍḍaṃ bhagavan <|> bhagavān āha | tat kasya hetoḥ²¹³
 <|> na sakṛdāgāmiṃ²¹⁴no evaṃ bhavati²¹⁴ mayā sakṛdāgāmiphalaṃ prāptam iti | tat kasmā²¹⁵dhetoḥ²¹⁵
 <|> na hi sa kaścid dharmāḥ yaḥ sakṛdāgāmitvam āpannaḥ <|> te^{35r1}(noc)y(ate sak)ṛdāgāmīti |

§9c; folio 35r1–4 (Cz 34.19–25)

bhagavān āha | tat kiṃ manyase subhūte ar^{2pi}nv anāgāmina {||} evaṃ bhavati mayā anāgāmiphalaṃ
 prāptam iti²¹⁶ <|> r³ tat kasya hetoḥ <|> na sa²¹⁷ kaścid dharmāḥ yo 'nāgāmīti | samanupaśyati²¹⁸ |
 tenor⁴cyate anāgāmīti |

§9d; folio 35r4–v2 (Cz 34.26–35.6)

bhagavān āha | tat kiṃ manyase subhūte | api nv²¹⁹ arha{m}r⁵to evaṃ bhavati mayārhatvaṃ
 prāptam iti | subhūtir āha | no hīdaṃ bhagavan²²⁰ | tat kar⁶(sya h)e(t)o(h) <|> (na) hi bhagavan sa²²¹
 kaścid dharmo yo 'rhan nāmaḥ²²² <|> {ya}²²³ saced bhagavann arhavi¹(ta evaṃ bha)v(en) m(ayārha)-
 tv(am p)r(ā)ptam iti | sa eva tasyātmagrāho bhavet | satvagrāho j(īv²va)grāhaḥ pudgalagrāho bhavet
 |

§9e; folio 35v2–36r1 (Cz 35.6–14)

aham²²⁴ asmi{n} bhagavan | || tathāgatenārhatā samya^{v3}sambuddhenāraṇavihāriṇām²²⁵ agryo nir-
 diṣṭaḥ <|> aham asmi{n} bhagavann arhan vigatav⁴rāgaḥ²²⁶ <|> na ca me bhagavann evaṃ bhavati
 a{r}ham asmi{nn} arhann²²⁷ iti | sacen mama bhagavav⁵nn evaṃ bhaven mayārhatvaṃ prāptam iti
 | na me tathāgato vyākariṣyati²²⁸ | araṇāv⁶(v)i(h)ā(r)i(nām²²⁹ a)grya iti²³⁰ subhūti(h) | kulaputro na
 kvacid viharati | 36r1 tenocyate | araṇāvihārīti araṇāvihārīti²³¹ |

§10a; folio 36r1–4 (Cz 35.15–20)

bhagavān āha | tat kiṃ manyase²³² r² subhūte | kaścid²³³ dharmas²³⁴ tathāgatena dīpaṃkarāt tathāgatā<d
 a>rhata<h> samyaksambuddhār^{3d}²³⁵ udgrhītaḥ <|> subhūtir āha | no hīdaṃ bhagavan <|> bhagavān

²¹³ S reads: *tat kasye hatoh*. M, Cz omit: *bhagavān āha tat kasya hetoh*.

²¹⁴ S reads: *bhaviti*.

²¹⁵ M, Cz: *tat kasya hetoh*.

²¹⁶ M, Cz add: *subhūtir āha no hīdaṃ bhagavan nānāgāmina evaṃ bhavati mayānāgāmiphalaṃ prāptam iti*.

²¹⁷ M, Cz: *hi sa bhagavan* for *sa*.

²¹⁸ M, Cz: *yo 'nāgāmitvam āpannaḥ* for *yo 'nāgāmīti / samanupaśyati*.

²¹⁹ S reads: *tv*.

²²⁰ M, Cz add: *nārhatā evaṃ bhavati mayārhattvaṃ prāptam iti* after *bhagavan*.

²²¹ M, Cz: *sa bhagavan* for *bhagavan sa*.

²²² M, Cz add: *tenocyate 'rhann iti*.

²²³ It is not clear why the scribe has written *ya* here.

²²⁴ M, Cz insert: *tat kasya hetoh* before *aham*.

²²⁵ M, Cz: *araṇāvihāriṇām*.

²²⁶ M, Cz: *vītarāgaḥ*.

²²⁷ S reads *arhānn*. M, Cz: *arhann asmy aham vītarāga* for *aham asmi arhann*.

²²⁸ M, Cz: *na māṃ tathāgato vyākariṣyad* for *na me tathāgato vyākariṣyati*.

²²⁹ M, Cz: *araṇāvihāriṇām*.

²³⁰ M, Cz omit: *iti*.

²³¹ M, Cz: *'raṇāvihāryaraṇāvihārīti*. Note that here S writes *araṇā*° where previously it had *araṇa*°.

²³² S reads: *manyasya*.

²³³ M, Cz: *asti sa kaścid*.

²³⁴ S reads: *dharmat*. M, Cz: *dharmo yas*.

²³⁵ M, Cz: *dīpaṃkarasya tathāgatasyārhatāḥ samyaksambuddhasyāmtikād* for *dīpaṃkarāt tathāgatā<d a>rhata<h>*

āha²³⁶ | na²³⁷ sa kaścīd dharmāḥ²³⁸ r4 tathāgatena dīpaṃkarāt tathāgatād arhataḥ samyaksaṃbuddhād²³⁹ udgrhītaḥ <|>

§10b; folio 36r4–v2 (Cz 35.21–25; P 180.17)

bhagavān⁵ āha | ya<h> kaścīd subhūte bodhisatvo evaṃ vaded ahaṃ kṣetravyūhān niṣpādayiṣyā-
mīr⁶ti²⁴⁰ sa vitatha<m> vadet | tat kasya hetoḥ <|> kṣetravyūhā<h> kṣetravīvyūhā iti subhūte
avyūhā hy ete²⁴¹ tathāgatena bhāṣitā<h> >²⁴² tenocyamte kṣetravyūhā iv²ti²⁴³ <|>

§10c; folio 36v2–37r3 (Cz 35.25–36.12; P 180.17–181.1)

tasmāt tarhi subhūte bodhisattvena evaṃ cittam utpādayitavyaṃ apratiṣṭhitam <|> na rūpa-
v³pratiṣṭhitam cittam utpādayitavyaṃ | na śabdagandharasaspraṣṭavyadharmapraṣṭhiv⁴taṃ cittam
utpādayitavyaṃ | na kvacitpratiṣṭhitam cittam utpādayitavyaṃ²⁴⁴ | tad yathā(p)i v⁵ nāma subhūte
puruṣo bhavet²⁴⁵ | yāsyaiṣāmrūpa{m}²⁴⁶ ātmabhāvaḥ syāt tad yathāpi (nāma su)v⁶meruḥ²⁴⁷ parvata-
rājā²⁴⁸ | tat ki<m> manyase su³⁷r¹bhūte²⁴⁹ mahān sa ātmabhāvo bhavet | subhūtir āha | mahān²⁵⁰
bhagavaṃ mahā<n> sugata | (sa ā)r²tmabhāvo bhavet²⁵¹ | bhagavaṃ²⁵² | tat kasya hetoḥ²⁵³ <|>
abhāvaḥ sa tathāgatena bhāṣitaḥ <|> tenor³cyate²⁵⁴ ātmabhāva iti | na hi²⁵⁵ sa bhāvaḥ²⁵⁶ <|> tenocyate
ātmabhāva iti ||

samyaksaṃbuddhād.

²³⁶ M, Cz omit: *bhagavān āha*.

²³⁷ M, Cz: *nāsti*.

²³⁸ M, Cz: *dharmo yas*.

²³⁹ M, Cz: *dīpaṃkarasya tathāgatasyārhataḥ samyaksaṃbuddhasyāṃtikād for dīpaṃkarāt tathāgatād arhataḥ samyak-
saṃbuddhād*.

²⁴⁰ S reads: *niṣpādayiṣyāmiti*.

²⁴¹ M, Cz: *te* for *hy ete*.

²⁴² P resumes here with the word *bhāṣitāḥ* / on fol. 6r1.

²⁴³ P: *tad ucyate kṣetravīvyūhā iti*.

²⁴⁴ For this section the wording in M, Cz runs: *tasmāt tarhi subhūte bodhisattvena mahāsattvenaivam apratiṣṭhitam
cittam utpādayitavyaṃ yan na kvacitpratiṣṭhitam cittam utpādayitavyaṃ na rūpapratiṣṭhitam cittam utpādayitavyaṃ
na śabdagandharasaspraṣṭavyadharmapraṣṭhitaṃ cittam utpādayitavyaṃ*. Pargiter reconstructs P as: *tasmā (subhūte
bodhisattvenaivam pra)tiṣṭhitam cittam utpāda(yitavyaṃ na śabda)gandharasasparśapraṣṭhitam cittam utpādayi-
tavyaṃ*. This reconstruction is highly problematical (among other things, the omission of any reference to *rūpa* is
unlikely), but without examining the ms itself any attempt to improve on it would be guesswork.

²⁴⁵ M, Cz add: *upetakāyo mahākāyo yat*. There is a gap of about 10 akṣaras in P, up to the word (*ā*)*tmabhāva*, which
Pargiter has not attempted to reconstruct. Whatever the wording, it cannot have agreed with M, Cz or with S.

²⁴⁶ M, Cz: *tasyaivaṃrūpa*.

²⁴⁷ S reads: (*su*)*meruḥ*. Cz: *sumeruḥ*; P: *sumeru-*.

²⁴⁸ M: *parvatarājah*.

²⁴⁹ M, Cz add: *api nu*.

²⁵⁰ M, Cz add: *sa* after *mahān*.

²⁵¹ P apparently omits: *subhūtir āha / mahān bhagavaṃ mahān sugata sa ātmabhāvo bhavet*, presumably through *saut
du même au même*.

²⁵² M, Cz omit: *bhagavaṃ* (and so apparently does P).

²⁵³ M, Cz add: *ātmabhāva ātmabhāva iti bhagavaṃ*. Like S, P and Tib. omit these words.

²⁵⁴ S reads: *tenacyate*; P: *tad ucyate*.

²⁵⁵ M, Cz add: *bhagavaṃ*.

²⁵⁶ M, Cz add *nābhāvaḥ*. This reading reflected in Tib. as well. P adds: *nātmabhāvaḥ*.

§11; folio 37r3–38r2 (Cz 36.13–37.10; P 181.1–13)

bhagavān āha | tar4t kiṃ manyase subhūte²⁵⁷ yāvaṃtyo²⁵⁸ gaṃgānadyāṃ²⁵⁹ vālukās tāvaṃtya²⁶⁰
 eva{m}²⁶¹ gaṃgānadyo bhar5veyuḥ <|>²⁶² api nu tāsu bahvyo vālukā bhaveyuḥ <|>²⁶³ subhūtir²⁶⁴
 āha | tā eva tāvad²⁶⁵ bhagavan bar6hvyo²⁶⁶ gaṃgānadyo bhaveyuḥ prāḡ eva yās tāsu²⁶⁷ vālukāḥ <|>
 bhagavān āha |²⁶⁸ ārocayāmi²⁶⁹ v1 te subhūte prativedayāmi²⁷⁰ te yāvaṃtyas²⁷¹ tāsu gaṃgānadiṣu
 vālukā bhaveyuḥ²⁷² <|> tāvaṃv2tyo lokadhātavaḥ²⁷³ kaścīd eva²⁷⁴ strī vā puruṣo vā²⁷⁵ saptaratna-
 pratipūrṇaṃ²⁷⁶ kṛtvā tathāv3gatebhyo 'rhadbhyah samyaksambuddhebhyo dānaṃ dadyāt | tat kiṃ
 manyase subhūte <|> api nu sā v4 strī vā puruṣo vā tatonidānaṃ bahu puṇyaṃ²⁷⁷ prasunuyāt |
 subhūtir²⁷⁸ āha | bahu bhagav5van bahu sugata²⁷⁹ | sā²⁸⁰ strī vā puruṣo vā²⁸¹ tatonidānaṃ bahu
 puṇyaṃ²⁸² prasunuyāt²⁸³ <|> bhagavāv6n āha | yaś ca khalu punaḥ subhūte²⁸⁴ tāvaṃtyo lokadhātavaḥ²⁸⁵
 saptaratnapratipūrṇaṃ²⁸⁶ 38r1 kṛtvā²⁸⁷ dānaṃ dadyāt | yaś ceto²⁸⁸ dharmaparyāyād aṃtaśāś²⁸⁹ catuṣ-

²⁵⁷ P apparently omits: *bhagavān āha* | *tat kiṃ manyase subhūte* (but see note below).

²⁵⁸ M, Cz: *yāvatyo*; P: (*yāvanto* *hi*) *subhūte*.

²⁵⁹ M, Cz: *gaṃgāyāṃ mahānadyāṃ*; P: *gaṃgāyā* (*nadyā*).

²⁶⁰ M, Cz: *tāvatya*; P: *tāvanto*.

²⁶¹ P omits: *eva*.

²⁶² P inserts: *tat kiṃ manyase subhūte*.

²⁶³ M, Cz: *tāsu yā vālukā api nu tā bahvyo* (Cz: *bahavyo*) *bhaveyuḥ*; P: *api nu tā bahvyo bhaveyuḥ* for *api nu tāsu bahvyo vālukā bhaveyuḥ*.

²⁶⁴ P omits: *subhūtir*.

²⁶⁵ P: *taceva tāva* for *tā eva tāvad*.

²⁶⁶ Cz: *bahavyo*.

²⁶⁷ M, Cz insert: *gaṃgānadiṣu*; P: *tatra* for *yās tāsu*.

²⁶⁸ P omits: *bhagavān āha*.

²⁶⁹ S reads: *ārocayāmi*. Frag e begins here.

²⁷⁰ S reads: *prativedayāmi*. Frag e: *prave*.

²⁷¹ M, Cz: *yāvatyas*; lacuna in P here. Frag e has a completely different wording: *///t(a)tra gaṃgānativālukāsamāsu gaṃgānad. + ///*.

²⁷² P apparently omits: *bhaveyuḥ*. There seems to be insufficient space in Frag e for it too.

²⁷³ S reads: *lokadhātavaḥ*; M, Cz: *tāvato lokadhātūn*; P: *tāvato lokadhātura* (?); Frag e: *kadhātum*.

²⁷⁴ P apparently omits: *eva*.

²⁷⁵ Frag e: *kaścīd eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā*.

²⁷⁶ M, Cz: *°paripūrṇaṃ* for *°pratipūrṇaṃ*; Frag e also supports *pari°*, but number of missing akṣaras at the end of line (approx. 8) suggests it may have read: *saptaratnapari(pūrṇaṃ dānaṃ dadyāt / ta)tonidānaṃ*. Long lacuna in P, ending at *āha*.

²⁷⁷ M, Cz: *puṇyaskandhaṃ* for *puṇyaṃ*. Frag e (*puṇya*) probably read with M, Cz. Cf. Tib.: *bsod nams*. Lacuna in P.

²⁷⁸ P omits: *subhūtir*. Frag e reads with S, M, Cz.

²⁷⁹ P, Frag e: *evaṃ bhagavaṃ bahu* for *bahu bhagavan bahu sugata*.

²⁸⁰ M, Cz omit: *sā*; P, Frag e: *sa*.

²⁸¹ P: *kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā*; Frag e: *ku(la) /// (duhi)tā vā*.

²⁸² M, Cz: *puṇyaskandhaṃ* for *bahu puṇyaṃ*. Frag e: *puṇy(a)*, so probably read with M, Cz. Cf. Tib.: *bsod nams*.

²⁸³ S reads: *prasunuyāda* (perhaps because the scribe was about to continue with *(a)prameyam asaṃkhyeyam*, but caught himself in time). M, Cz: *prasunuyād aprameyam asaṃkhyeyam* for *prasunuyāt*. That this amplification is a mistake is suggested both by context and by the parallel in §8 above. Tib. also lacks it, and there is not enough space in Frag e for it. Unfortunately, there is another long lacuna in P at this point, for which Pargiter conjectures *tato puṇyaskandhaṃ prasaveta bhagavān āha yaś ca ho punaḥ*.

²⁸⁴ M, Cz add: *strī vā puruṣo vā*. P, Frag e read with S.

²⁸⁵ M, Cz: *tāvato lokadhātūn*; P: *tāvatā lokadhātum*; Frag e: *tāvantaṃ lokadhā(tum)*.

²⁸⁶ M, Cz, P: *°paripūrṇaṃ* for *°pratipūrṇaṃ*. Frag e missing.

²⁸⁷ P, Frag e omit *kṛtvā*; M, Cz add: *tathāgatebhyo 'rhadbhyah samyaksambuddhebhyo*.

²⁸⁸ M, Cz, P: *ca* (P adds three akṣaras here: *subhūte*?) *kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā*. Frag e reads with S.

²⁸⁹ P has insufficient space for much more than *ito* here. Missing in Frag e.

padikām²⁹⁰ api gāthām ur2dgrhya parebhyo²⁹¹ deśayet²⁹² | ayam²⁹³ tato²⁹⁴ bahutaram punyam²⁹⁵ pra<sunuyād apra>meyam asaṃkhyeyam²⁹⁶ |

§12; folio 38r2–v1 (Cz 37.10–19; P 181.13–182.3)

api r3 tu khalu²⁹⁷ subhūte yasmin pṛthivīpradeśe ito²⁹⁸ dharmaparyāyād aṃtaśaś²⁹⁹ catuṣpadir4kām³⁰⁰ api gāthām³⁰¹ bhāṣyeta³⁰² vā deśyeta vā³⁰³ sa pṛthivīpradeśaś caityabhūto bhar5vet³⁰⁴ | sadeva-mānuṣāsurasya lokasya kaḥ punar vādaḥ subhūte³⁰⁵ ya imaṃ dharmapar6ryāyam³⁰⁶ dhārayiṣyamti³⁰⁷ paramēṇa te³⁰⁸ āścaryeṇa samanvāgatā bhaviṣyamti | tav1smimś ca³⁰⁹ pṛthivīpradeśe śāstā viharaty anyatarānyataro vā gurusthānīyaḥ³¹⁰ <|>

§13a; folio 38v1–5 (Cz 37.20–38.2; P 182.3–8)

evam uv2kte³¹¹ āyusmān subhūtir bhagavaṃtam e<ta>d avocat | ko nāmāyam bhagavan dharmaparyāyaḥ kav3thaṃ cainaṃ dhārayāmi | evam ukte bhagavān āyusmaṃtaṃ subhūtim etad avocat | prajñāpāv4ramitā nāmāya<m> subhūte dharmaparyāyaḥ <|> evaṃ cainaṃ³¹² dhāraya³¹³ | tat kasya hetoḥ <|> yaiva³¹⁴ subhū<te>³¹⁵ v5 prajñāpāramitā tathāgatena bhāṣitā | saivāpāramitā³¹⁶ |

§13b; folio 38v5–39r1 (Cz 38.3–6; P 182.8–10)

tat kiṃ manyase subhūte³¹⁷ v6 api nu sa³¹⁸ kaści<d>³¹⁹ dharmo³²⁰ tathāgatena bhāṣitaḥ <|> subhūtir³²¹

²⁹⁰ M, Cz: *catuṣpādikām*. P: *cātuṣpādām*; Frag e: + + .. *kām*.

²⁹¹ P: *parasya*.

²⁹² M, Cz add: *saṃprakāśayed*; P may have had this too. Missing in Frag e, but probably enough space for *deś(ayet saṃprakāśayed aya)*, since approximately 8 akṣaras are missing at end of line.

²⁹³ M, Cz add: *eva*. Frag e: *m eva tena pūrvakena*.

²⁹⁴ M, Cz: *tato nidānaṃ for tato*. Frag e: see preceding note. Lacuna in P, then: *kulaputreṇa kuladu(hitṛṇā) vā*.

²⁹⁵ M, Cz, P: *pūnyaskamdhām*. Missing in Frag e.

²⁹⁶ P: *prasaveta* for *pūnyam pra<sunuyād apra>meyam asaṃkhyeyam*. Frag e also has *prasaveta*, apparently reading with P.

²⁹⁷ M, Cz add: *punaḥ*; P, Frag e omit: *khalu*.

²⁹⁸ P apparently omits: *ito*. Missing in Frag e.

²⁹⁹ P apparently omits: *aṃtaśaś*. Frag e has *anta* ..

³⁰⁰ M, Cz: *catuṣpādikām*. P: *cātuṣpādām*. Missing in Frag e.

³⁰¹ Frag e: *gāthā*. M, Cz add: *udgrhya*.

³⁰² P: *bhāṣyate*; Frag e: *bhāṣiṣyate*.

³⁰³ M, Cz: *vā saṃprakāśyeta vā* for *vā deśyeta vā*. P, Frag e: *tena* for *vā deśyeta vā*.

³⁰⁴ P: *bhaviṣyati* for *bhavet*. Frag e reads *ṣyati*, therefore must have read with P.

³⁰⁵ M, Cz, Frag e omit: *subhūte*. Lacuna in P.

³⁰⁶ M, Cz add: *sakalasamāptam*. Lacuna in P, but P probably read with S. Frag e reads with S.

³⁰⁷ M, Cz add: *vācayiṣyamti paryavāpsyamti parebhyaś ca vistareṇa saṃprakāśayiṣyamti*. Frag e: *udgrhñiṣyan(t)i* for *dhārayiṣyamti*. Lacuna in P, but P probably read with S. Frag e breaks off at this point.

³⁰⁸ M, Cz add: *subhūte*; P adds: *satvā*.

³⁰⁹ M, Cz add: *subhūte*; P: *tasmim* (without *ca*).

³¹⁰ M, Cz: *vijñaguru°* for *guru°*. Lacuna in P would apparently permit *vijñaguru°*.

³¹¹ P: *atha* for *evam ukte*.

³¹² P adds: *kāmaṃ*.

³¹³ P: *dhārayata*.

³¹⁴ P: *yā ceyam* for *yaiva*.

³¹⁵ P omits: *subhūte*.

³¹⁶ M, Cz add: *tathāgatena bhāṣitā / tenocyate prajñāpāramiteti*. The lacuna in P is probably to be reconstructed (reading with S) as *-ṣitā saivāpāramitā tat ki-*, not *-ṣitā sā pāramitā tat ki-* as Pargiter has it.

³¹⁷ S follows *subhūte* with the akṣaras *anu*, subsequently deleted by being struck through. The many scribal errors in

āha <|> no hīdam³²² bhagavan | {bhaga<vā>39r1n āha} | na sa kaścid³²³ bhagavaṃ³²⁴ {d}dharmo
yaḥ³²⁵ tathāgate<na> bhāṣi³²⁶ta<h> |>

§13c; folio 39r1–6 (Cz 38.7–15; G 5a1–2; P182.10–15)

³²⁷yāvataḥ³²⁸ subhūte³²⁹ r2 trsāhasramahāsāhasryām³³⁰ lokadhātau³³¹ prthivīrajaḥ kaccit³³² tad bahu³³³
bhavet³³⁴ | sur3bhūtir³³⁵ āha | bahu bhagavans tat³³⁶ prthivīrajo bhavet |³³⁷ yat ta<d> bhagavan |
prthir4vīrajaḥ tathāgatena bhāṣitaḥ³³⁸ arajaḥ sa³³⁹ tathāgatena³⁴⁰ bhāṣitaḥ³⁴¹ <|> tar5d³⁴² ucyate
prthivīraja iti | yā sā³⁴³ lokadhātur³⁴⁴ adhātuḥ sā³⁴⁵ tathāgatena bhāṣitaḥ <|> r6 tad³⁴⁶ ucyate lokadhātur
iti ||

§13d; folio 39r6–v4 (Cz 38.16–24; G 5a2–3; P 182.15–20)

bhagavān āha |³⁴⁷ tat kiṃ manyase subhūte³⁴⁸ dvātrīṃśadbhir³⁴⁹ mav1(h)āpuruṣalakṣaṇaiḥ³⁵⁰ tathāgato
'rhan samyak sambuddho³⁵¹ draṣṭavya<h> | subhūtir³⁵² āha | no hīv2dam³⁵³ bhagavan³⁵⁴ {bhagavān

this section indicate a serious lapse of attention on the part of the copyist.

³¹⁸ M, Cz: *api nv asti sa*; P: *api nu*, for *api nu sa*.

³¹⁹ P: *kaści*.

³²⁰ M, Cz add: *yas*.

³²¹ P omits: *subhūtir*.

³²² P: *no iti* for *no hīdam*.

³²³ M, Cz: *nāsti sa kaścid*; lacuna in P, in which Pargiter reconstructs *na kaści* for *na sa kaścid*.

³²⁴ M, Cz, P (apparently) omit: *bhagavaṃ*.

³²⁵ P apparently omits: *yaḥ*.

³²⁶ G begins here, on fol. 5r1.

³²⁷ M, Cz add: *bhagavān āha* / *tat kiṃ manyase subhūte*; G adds: *bhagavān āha*. P reads with S.

³²⁸ M, Cz, P, G: *yāvat*.

³²⁹ M, Cz omit: *subhūte*. G, P (apparently) have it.

³³⁰ M, Cz, P, G (*trs-* reconstructed): *trisāhasramahāsāhasre*.

³³¹ S reads: *lokadhātu*. Emended to *lokadhātau* in line with M, Cz, P, G.

³³² S reads: *kaścit*. M, Cz, G: *kaccit*; P: *kiñcit*.

³³³ G: *vahu*.

³³⁴ G omits: *bhavet*.

³³⁵ G, P (apparently) omit: *subhūtir*.

³³⁶ P omits: *tat*; M, Cz: *bahu sugata* for *tat*. Note that the use of *virāma* at this point in S (*bhagavan* stat*) is unusual, reflecting a collision of the “honorific punctuation” of the ms with the rules of sandhi.

³³⁷ M, Cz add: *tat kasya hetoḥ*. P and G (originally) read with S.

³³⁸ M, Cz: *tathāgatena bhāṣitaḥ*; P: *tathāgatena bh(āṣitaḥ)*; G omits: *bhavet* / *yat tad bhagavan prthivīrajaḥ tathāgatena bhāṣitaḥ*, suggesting that its recension must originally have read: *bahu bhagavan tat prthivīrajaḥ bhavet* / *yat tat prthivīrajaḥ arajas tathāgatena bhāṣitas*.

³³⁹ M, Cz: *tad bhagavaṃs*; P: *tad bhagavaṃ* for *sa*. G omits: *sa*.

³⁴⁰ P apparently omits: *tathāgatena*.

³⁴¹ M, Cz, P (apparently): *bhāṣitaḥ*.

³⁴² M, Cz, G: *tena*. Lacuna in P, Pargiter reconstructs *tad ucyate*.

³⁴³ M, Cz, G: *yo 'py asau* ; P: *yo so* for *yā sā*.

³⁴⁴ M, Cz add: *tathāgatena bhāṣito*. G, P omit this phrase with S.

³⁴⁵ M, Cz, G: *sa*; P: *sas*.

³⁴⁶ M, Cz, G: *tena*. P reads with S.

³⁴⁷ P omits: *bhagavān āha* /.

³⁴⁸ P adds: (*api*) *nu*.

³⁴⁹ M, Cz: *dvātrīṃśan*^o (as first element of compound); G: *dvātrīṃśatā*; P: *dvātrīṃśar* (but elsewhere *dvātrīṃśa*^o as first element in compound).

³⁵⁰ G: *mahāpuruṣalakṣaṇāni*.

āha} ³⁵⁵ | tat kasya hetoḥ³⁵⁶ <|> yāni tāni³⁵⁷ bhagavan³⁵⁸ dvātrīṣaṇmahāpuru<ṣa>v3lakṣaṇāni³⁵⁹
tathāgatena bhāṣitāny alakṣaṇāni³⁶⁰ ta<thā>gatena bhāṣitāni³⁶¹ tasmād³⁶² ucyamte dvāv4trīṣaṇmahā-
puruṣalakṣaṇānīti |

§13e; folio 39v4–40r1 (Cz 39.1–8; G 5a3–5; P 182.20–183.3)

bhagavān āha |³⁶³ yaś ca khalu³⁶⁴ punaḥ subhūte strī vā puv5ruṣo vā³⁶⁵ gaṃgānadīvālukupamān³⁶⁶
ātmabhāvān parityajet³⁶⁷ | yaś ceto dharmaparyāyāc³⁶⁸ catuṣpav6dikām³⁶⁹ api gāthām udgrhya parebhyo
deṣayet³⁷⁰ | ayam³⁷¹ tattonidānaṃ bahutaram³⁷² puṇyam³⁷³ pra40r1<sunuyād³⁷⁴ apra>meyam asaṃ-
khyeyam³⁷⁵ |

§14a; folio 40r1–v1 (Cz 39.9–21; G 5a5–5b1; P 183.3–10)

atha khalv³⁷⁶ āyusmān subhūtiḥ dharmapravegenāsrūṇi³⁷⁷ prāmuṃcat | r2 pravartayam³⁷⁸ so 'srūṇi
parimārjya³⁷⁹ bhagavaṃtam etad avocat | āścaryam bhagavan | paramār3ścaryam sugata | yāvad
ayam dharmaparyāyaḥ tathāgatena³⁸⁰ bhāṣitaḥ³⁸¹ <|> yato me bhar4gavan |³⁸² jñānam utpannam na
mayā³⁸³ jātv eva³⁸⁴ dharmaparyāyaḥ śrutapūrvāḥ <|> r5 parameṇa te bhagavan |³⁸⁵ āścaryeṇa³⁸⁶

³⁵¹ G omits: 'rhan samyaksambuddho.

³⁵² G, P omit: subhūtir.

³⁵³ G: no; P: no iti for no hīdam.

³⁵⁴ S reads: *bhagavad* (because of the following *bhagavān āha*). M, Cz add: *na dvātrīṣaṇmahāpuruṣalakṣaṇais tathāgato 'rhan samyaksambuddho draṣṭavyaḥ*. Lacuna in P insufficient for this addition.

³⁵⁵ Cz, G, P omit: *bhagavān āha*.

³⁵⁶ S reads: *hatoḥ*.

³⁵⁷ G: *tāni tāni*; M, Cz: *yāni hi tāni*, for *yāni tāni*. P: (*yāni*) *tāni*.

³⁵⁸ G, P omit *bhagavan*.

³⁵⁹ S reads: *dvātrīṣaṇ*°.

³⁶⁰ M, Cz add: *tāni bhagavaṃs*; P adds: *tāni*.

³⁶¹ G omits: *tathāgatena bhāṣitāni*.

³⁶² M, Cz, G: *tena* for *tasmād*. Lacuna in P.

³⁶³ P omits: *bhagavān āha* |.

³⁶⁴ P: *ho* for *khalu*.

³⁶⁵ M, Cz add: *dine dine*.

³⁶⁶ G: °*bālukupamān*; M, Cz: °*vālukāsamān*; P: °*vālikā(samān?)*.

³⁶⁷ M, Cz add: *evam parityajan gaṃgānadīvālukāsamān kalpāṃs tāt ātmabhāvān parityajet*. Lacuna in P. G reads with S.

³⁶⁸ M, Cz, G add *aṃtaśaś* after *dharmaparyāyād* (P: *dharmaparyāyā*).

³⁶⁹ M, Cz: *cātuṣpadikām*; P: *cātuṣpadikām*. G: *cātuṣpadikām* with S.

³⁷⁰ M, Cz add: *saṃprakāśayed*. Lacuna in P. G reads with S.

³⁷¹ M, Cz, G add: *eva*. Lacuna in P, Pargiter reconstructs: *ayam eva tato bahutaram*, etc.

³⁷² G: *bahu* for *bahutaram*.

³⁷³ M, Cz, P (reconstructed): *puṇyaskamdhām*.

³⁷⁴ G: *prasaveta*; P: (*prasave*)*ta* for *prasunuyād*.

³⁷⁵ P omits: *aprameyam asaṃkhyeyam*. In S the restored syllables *sunuyād apra* have clearly been lost as a result of the jump from the end of one folio (39) to the beginning of the next (40).

³⁷⁶ P omits: *khalv*.

³⁷⁷ M, Cz, P: °*vegenā*° for °*pravegenā*°. G: °*pravegenā*°.

³⁷⁸ M, Cz, G, P (reconstructed) omit: *pravartayam*.

³⁷⁹ S reads: *parimārjyā*; M, Cz, P (reconstructed): *pramrjya*; G: *prāmṛjya* for *parimārjya*.

³⁸⁰ P: *tathāgatena dharmaparyāyo* for *dharmaparyāyaḥ tathāgatena*.

³⁸¹ M, Cz add (after *bhāṣito*): °*grayānasamprasthitānām sattvānām arthāya śreṣṭhayanāsamprasthitānām arthāya*.

³⁸² P (reconstructed) omits: *bhagavan*.

³⁸³ M, Cz add: *bhagavañ*; G: *me* for *mayā*.

samanvāgatā³⁸⁷ bhaviṣyamti ya iha sūr⁶tre bhāṣyamāṇe³⁸⁸ bhūta(ṁ)jñām utpādayiṣyamti <|>³⁸⁹ yā
caiṣā³⁹⁰ bhagavan | bhūtasamjñā saivā^{v1}saṁjñā³⁹¹ tasmā<t>³⁹² tathāgato bhāṣate bhūtasamjñā bhūta-
samjñeti |

§14b; folio 40v1–4 (Cz 40.1–8; G 5b1–2; P 183.10–16)

na mama³⁹³ bhagavann āścaryam³⁹⁴ yad av²ham³⁹⁵ dharmaparyāyam bhāṣyamāṇam³⁹⁶ avakalpayāmy
adhimucyāmi³⁹⁷ | ye³⁹⁸ te bhagavann³⁹⁹ imaṁ⁴⁰⁰ dharmapav³ryāyam udgrhīṣyamti paryavāpsyamti
dhā(ra)yiṣyamti⁴⁰¹ | te paramāścaryasamav⁴nvāgatā⁴⁰² bhaviṣyamti | ||

§14c; folio 40v4–41r1 (Cz 40.9–15; G 5b2–3; P 183.16–184.3)

api tu khalu⁴⁰³ punaḥ bhagavan⁴⁰⁴ na teṣāṁ⁴⁰⁵ ātmasamjñā v⁵ pravartsyate⁴⁰⁶ | na satvasamjñā na
jīvasamjñā⁴⁰⁷ | na pudgalasamjñā pravartsyate⁴⁰⁸ |⁴⁰⁹ tat kasya heto<h>⁴¹⁰ v⁶ yāsāv⁴¹¹ ātmasamjñā
saivāsamjñā <|> yā satvasamjñā jīvasamjñā⁴¹² pudgalasamjñā saivāsamjñā⁴¹³ | tat ka⁴¹r¹sya hetoḥ
<|> sarvasamjñāpagatā hi buddhā bhagava<m̐ta>h ||

³⁸⁴ M, Cz: *evamrūpo*; G: *ayam* for *eva*. Lacuna in P, Pargiter reconstructs *na ma(yā evamrūpo dharmapa)ryāyah*, but *na ma(yā jātv eva dharmapa)ryāyah* is equally possible.

³⁸⁵ P omits: *bhagavan*.

³⁸⁶ P: *satvāścaryeṇa* for *āścaryeṇa*.

³⁸⁷ M, Cz add: *bodhisattvā*.

³⁸⁸ M, Cz add: *śrutvā*.

³⁸⁹ M, Cz add: *tat kasya hetoḥ*.

³⁹⁰ P: *yaiṣā* for *yā caiṣā*.

³⁹¹ M, Cz: *saivābhūtasamjñā* for *saivāsamjñā*. G, P read with S.

³⁹² P: *tasmā*.

³⁹³ G: *me*.

³⁹⁴ P: *duṣkaram*. This reading adopted by Cz, contra M and G, which read *āścaryam* with S.

³⁹⁵ M: *yadāham imaṁ*; Cz, P, G: *yad aham imaṁ*.

³⁹⁶ P inserts: *nu*.

³⁹⁷ M, Cz: *adhimucye*; G: *adhimucya*; P: *a[ty a]dhimucyām* for *adhimucyāmi*.

³⁹⁸ M, Cz: *ye 'pi*. Lacuna in P.

³⁹⁹ G inserts: *satvā*; M, Cz insert: *sattvā bhaviṣyamty anāgate 'dhvani paścime kāle paścime samaye paścimāyām pañcaśatyām saddharmavipralope vartamāne ya*, lacuna in P, ending with the word *pañcāśatyām*, suggesting similarity to M, Cz.

⁴⁰⁰ M, Cz insert: *bhagavan*.

⁴⁰¹ M, Cz: *udgrahīṣyamti dhārayiṣyamti vācayīṣyamti paryavāpsyamti parebhyaś ca vistareṇa saṁprakāśayiṣyamti*; G: *udgrahīṣyanti yāvat paryavāpsyanti* for *udgrhīṣyamti paryavāpsyamti dhārayiṣyamti*. P has several lacunae, but may possibly be reconstructed: *avakalpayiṣyanti adhi(mucy)i(ṣyanti vista)reṇa (ca parasya saṁprakāśayiṣya)nti*.

⁴⁰² M, Cz: *paramāścaryeṇa samanvāgatā*. P, G read with S.

⁴⁰³ P: *ho*.

⁴⁰⁴ P: *subhūte* for *bhagavan*.

⁴⁰⁵ S reads: *meṣām*.

⁴⁰⁶ M, Cz: *pravartīṣyate*, P: *pravartī(ṣyati)*. G: *pravartsyate* with S.

⁴⁰⁷ P inserts: *pravartīṣyati*.

⁴⁰⁸ M, Cz: *pravartīṣyate*; P: *pravartīṣyati*; G omits.

⁴⁰⁹ M, Cz add: *nāpi teṣāṁ kācit samjñā nāsamjñā pravartate*.

⁴¹⁰ S reads: *hato*.

⁴¹¹ M, Cz: *yā sā* (Cz: *sa*) *bhagavann*; P: *yā sā* for *yā asau*.

⁴¹² P inserts: *yā*. Reconstruct P in the lacuna as *yā sā satvasamjñā yā jīva-?* Cf. Pargiter, p. 184, n. 2.

⁴¹³ G omits: *tat kasya hetoḥ | yāsāv* (or *yā sā*) *ātmasamjñā saivāsamjñā / yā satvasamjñā jīvasamjñā pudgalasamjñā saivāsamjñā*.

§14d; folio 41r1–v1 (Cz 40.16–41.4; G 5b3–5; P 184.4–9)

evam ukte bhagavān ā²yuṣmaṁtaṁ subhūtim etad avocat⁴¹⁴ | evam etat subhūte evam etat⁴¹⁵
subhūte⁴¹⁶ r³ paramā<śca>ryasamanvāgatās te satvā⁴¹⁷ bhaviṣyanti | ya iha⁴¹⁸ sūtre bhāṣyamā⁴¹⁹
śrutvā⁴²⁰ not<t>raṣiṣyanti | na samtrasiṣyanti | <na> samtrāsam āpatsyante⁴²¹ <|> tar⁵t kasya hetoḥ
<|> paramapāramiteyaṁ subhūte tathāgatena bhāṣitā⁴²² <|> yā<m> ca⁴²³ r⁶ tathāgataḥ paramapārami-
tāṁ bhāṣate⁴²⁴ tām aparimāṇā⁴²⁵ buddhā bhav¹gavaṁto bhāṣante <| te>nocyate paramapāramiteti
|⁴²⁶

§14e; folio 41v1–42v3 (Cz 41.5–42.5; G 5b5–7; P 184.10–185.4)

api tu khalu punaḥ⁴²⁷ subhūv²te yā⁴²⁸ tathāgatasya kṣāṁtipāramitā saivāpāramitā <|> tat kasya
hetoḥ⁴²⁹ <|> yadā v³ me⁴³⁰ subhūte⁴³¹ kalimgarājā⁴³² aṁgapratyaṁgāny⁴³³ a(c)chetsin⁴³⁴ nāsīn me⁴³⁵
tasmin samav⁴ye ātmasaṁjñā vā satvasaṁjñā vā jīvasaṁjñā vā pudgalasaṁjñā⁴³⁶ vā na⁴³⁷ me
kā{||}v⁵cit⁴³⁸ saṁjñā nāsaṁjñā⁴³⁹ babhūva <|> tat kasya hetoḥ <|> sacet subhūte mama⁴⁴⁰ tasmin
sav⁶maye ātmasaṁjñābhaviṣyat |⁴⁴¹ {d}vyāpādasamjñāpi⁴⁴² me 'bhaviṣyat {||} tasmin sa^{42r1}maye⁴⁴³

⁴¹⁴ G: bhagavān āha for evam ukte bhagavān āyuṣmaṁtaṁ subhūtim etad avocat.

⁴¹⁵ P: eta.

⁴¹⁶ M, Cz omit: subhūte. G omits this second evam etat subhūte.

⁴¹⁷ G omits: satvā. Lacuna in P.

⁴¹⁸ M, Cz insert: subhūte.

⁴¹⁹ G: imaṁ dharmaparyāyaṁ for iha sūtre bhāṣyamāṇe.

⁴²⁰ M, Cz, P omit: śrutvā. G has it.

⁴²¹ P: āpatsyanti.

⁴²² M, Cz add: yadutāpāramitā (but M notes that J omits this). This extra phrase does not appear in G, P, or Tib. either.

⁴²³ M, Cz insert: subhūte.

⁴²⁴ P: yā tathāgatena parama(pāramitā bhāṣitā) for yāṁ ca tathāgataḥ paramapāramitāṁ bhāṣate.

⁴²⁵ M, Cz add: api.

⁴²⁶ As Pargiter notes, the lacuna in P is too short to contain all the words tām aparimāṇā buddhā bhagavaṁto bhāṣante | tenocyate paramapāramiteti.

⁴²⁷ P omits: khalu punaḥ.

⁴²⁸ G: ya.

⁴²⁹ S reads: hatoḥ.

⁴³⁰ G omits: me.

⁴³¹ P omits: subhūte.

⁴³² G: kalī° for kalimga°. P's (ka)liṁgarājā is mostly reconstruction.

⁴³³ M, Cz, G, P (reconstructed): aṁgapratyaṁgamāmsāny for aṁgapratyaṁgāny.

⁴³⁴ M, Cz, G: acchaitṣi; P: (acchai)tsī for acchetsin.

⁴³⁵ P: nāsī me. M, Cz omit: nāsīn me. G reads with S.

⁴³⁶ P: satvajīvapudgalasaṁjñā for satvasaṁjñā vā jīvasaṁjñā vā pudgalasaṁjñā.

⁴³⁷ M, Cz add: api. A significant omission in G begins here (see below).

⁴³⁸ P: kāci.

⁴³⁹ M, Cz: vāsaṁjñā vā for nāsaṁjñā. P reads with S.

⁴⁴⁰ M, Cz, P: sacen me subhūte for sacet subhūte mama.

⁴⁴¹ G omits: na me kācit saṁjñā nāsaṁjñā babhūva tat kasya hetoḥ sacet subhūte mama tasmin samaye ātmasaṁjñābhaviṣyat (and possibly more in addition, as is suggested by M, Cz and P; see below). Although conditionals occasionally appear in Buddhist texts without the augment (see BHS 31.38–40), there is no reason why S should be read differently from the other witnesses in this regard. Here M, Cz, P: ātmāsaṁjñābhaviṣyat (C writes: ātmā-saṁjñā-abhaviṣyat).

⁴⁴² P omits: api. G: vyāpādasamjñā vāpi.

⁴⁴³ M, Cz, P, G: me tasmin samaye 'bhaviṣyat for me 'bhaviṣyat tasmin samaye. M, Cz add: sacet sattvasaṁjñā jīvasaṁjñā pudgalasaṁjñābhaviṣyat vyāpādasamjñāpi me tasmin samaye 'bhaviṣyat | tat kasya hetoḥ; P (partly reconstructed) adds: (sacet sattvajīva)saṁjñā | pudgalasaṁjñābhaviṣya(t* vyā)pādasamjñā me tasmiṁ samaye

<|> abhijānāmy ahaṃ subhūte atīte 'dhvani paṃca jātiśatāni yad ar2haṃ⁴⁴⁴ kṣāṃtivādī riṣir⁴⁴⁵ abhū tadāpi⁴⁴⁶ me nātmasaṃjñā babhūva⁴⁴⁷ | na satvasaṃjñā r3 na jīvasaṃjñā na pudgalasaṃjñā⁴⁴⁸ | tasmāt⁴⁴⁹ tarhi subhūte bodhisatvena mahāsar4tvena⁴⁵⁰ sarvasaṃjñā vivarjayitvānuttarāyāṃ⁴⁵¹ s(a-m)y(a)ksaṃbodhau cittam utpādar5yitavyam | na rūpapraṭiṣṭhitam cittam utpādayitavyam | na śabdagandharasaspraṣṭar6vyapraṭiṣṭhi{m}tam⁴⁵² cittam utpādayitavyam | na dharmapraṭiṣṭhitam cittam utpādayiv1tavyam | nādharmapraṭiṣṭhitam cittam⁴⁵³ utpādayitavyam | na kvacitpraṭiṣṭhitam cittav2m utpādayitavyam | tat kasmād dhetoḥ⁴⁵⁴ <|> yat praṭiṣṭhi<ta>m tad evāpraṭiṣṭhi<ta>m <|> tasmād eva{m} v3 tathāgato bhāṣate⁴⁵⁵ rūpāpraṭiṣṭhitena dānaṃ dātavyam⁴⁵⁶ |

§14f, folio 42v3–43r1 (Cz 42.5–12; P 185.4–8)

api tu khalu v4 punaḥ⁴⁵⁷ subhūte bodhisatvenaivaṃ⁴⁵⁸ dānaparityāgaḥ parityajyaḥ⁴⁵⁹ sarvasatvānām av5rthāya <|>⁴⁶⁰ yaiva ca⁴⁶¹ satvasaṃjñā sa evāsaṃjñā⁴⁶² | ya eva te⁴⁶³ sarvasatvā<h> tathāgav6tena bhāṣitāḥ ta evāsatvāḥ⁴⁶⁴ <|> bhūtavādī subhūte tathāgataḥ satyavādī 43r1 tathāvādī⁴⁶⁵ tathāgato na vitathāvādī⁴⁶⁶ tathāgato |⁴⁶⁷

'bhaviṣyat. In lacking such an addition G appears at first sight closest to S, but the long omission noted above can only be explained by the addition's presence in G's exemplar. See Schopen 2004a: 135, n. 7 for detailed comments on this. The text on which G is based may thus have read something like: *nāsīn me tasmin samaye ātmasaṃjñā vā satvasaṃjñā vā jīvasaṃjñā vā pudgalasaṃjñā vā / na me kācī saṃjñā nāsaṃjñā babhūva | tat kasya hetoḥ | sacet subhūte mama tasmin samaye ātmasaṃjñābhaviṣyad vyāpādasamjñāpi me tasmin samaye 'bhaviṣyat | sacet sattvasaṃjñābhaviṣyad jīvasaṃjñā vā pudgalasaṃjñā vā vyāpādasamjñāpi me tasmin samaye 'bhaviṣyat*. After the omission of the portion in bold by homoeoteleuton, *vā* may have been added to smooth over the resulting awkwardness. The upshot of all this is that this passage in S may also be defective.

⁴⁴⁴ P: yadāhaṃ; G: yo 'haṃ.

⁴⁴⁵ M, Cz, G: kṣāṃtivādī rṣir; P: kṣāntivādī rṣir.

⁴⁴⁶ M, Cz: abhūvaṃ | tatrāpi; G: abhūvaṃ tatrāpi; P: babhū(va tatra) for abhū tadāpi. Here we read the *abhū* as the root aorist form *abhūt*, which often appears without the final *t*, and is used for various persons and numbers. Cf. BHS 32.107. However, the reading *abhū<t> tadāpi* is also possible.

⁴⁴⁷ G: nātmasaṃjñābhūn (i.e. *abhūt*).

⁴⁴⁸ M, Cz add: babhūva.

⁴⁴⁹ P: tasmā.

⁴⁵⁰ P omits: mahāsatvena.

⁴⁵¹ S reads: *vīnarjayitvānuttarasyāṃ*. G: *varjayitvā°* (right at end of 5v7, after which folio 6 of G is missing).

⁴⁵² M, Cz: °*spraṣṭavyadharmapraṭiṣṭhitam* for °*spraṣṭavyapraṭiṣṭhitam*.

⁴⁵³ S reads: *cattam*.

⁴⁵⁴ M, Cz: *tat kasya hetoḥ* for *tat kasmād dhetoḥ*. P omits. Note that the lacunae in P make reconstruction of this section very difficult, although it is obviously much condensed.

⁴⁵⁵ P: bhāṣati.

⁴⁵⁶ M, Cz: *apraṭiṣṭhitena bodhisattvena dānaṃ dātavyam | na rūpaśabdagaṃdharasasparśa* (Cz: *spraṣṭavya*) *dharmapraṭiṣṭhitena dānaṃ dātavyam*; P: *na rūpāpraṭiṣṭhitena bodhisattve(na dānaṃ) dātavyam* for *rūpāpraṭiṣṭhitena dānaṃ dātavyam*.

⁴⁵⁷ P omits: *khalu punaḥ*.

⁴⁵⁸ M, Cz: *evamrūpo* for *evaṃ*.

⁴⁵⁹ M, Cz: *kartavyaḥ* for *parityajyaḥ*. P: *dānaparityāgaṃ parityajya* for *dānaparityāgaḥ parityajyaḥ*.

⁴⁶⁰ M, Cz adds: *tat kasya hetoḥ*.

⁴⁶¹ M, Cz: *yā caiśā subhūte*; P: *yā caiva sā* for *yaiva ca*.

⁴⁶² M, Cz, P: *saivāsaṃjñā* for *sa evāsaṃjñā*.

⁴⁶³ M, Cz: *evaṃ te*; P: *ete* for *eva te*.

⁴⁶⁴ M, Cz add: *tat kasya hetoḥ* (but M notes its omission in Ch and T).

⁴⁶⁵ M, Cz: *tathāvādy ananyathāvādī*; P: *tathatāvā* for *tathāvādī*.

⁴⁶⁶ S reads: *nāvitathāvādī*. M, Cz: *na vitathāvādī*; P: *avitathāvādī* for *na vitathāvādī*.

⁴⁶⁷ P omits: *tathāgato*.

§14g; folio 43r1–6 (Cz 42.12–20; P 185.8–14)

api tu khalu punaḥ⁴⁶⁸ subhūte yaḥ⁴⁶⁹ tathā²gatena dharmo 'bhisambuddho deśito vā⁴⁷⁰ na tatra satyaṃ na mṛṣā <|> tad yathāpi nāma⁴⁷¹ subhūte r3 puruṣo⁴⁷² 'ndhakāra{h}praviṣṭaḥ⁴⁷³ <|> evaṃ vastupatito bo(dh)isatvo draṣṭavyo⁴⁷⁴ yo vastupatitaṃ⁴⁷⁵ dār4naṃ parityajati | tad yathāpi nāma⁴⁷⁶ subhūte cakṣuṣmān {} puruṣo⁴⁷⁷ (v)i(bh)ā(t)āyā<m> rātryā<m>⁴⁷⁸ sūr5rye 'bhyudgate nānāvidhāni⁴⁷⁹ rūpāni paśyet | evaṃ⁴⁸⁰ bodhisatvo draṣṭavyo yo vastvapatir6taṃ⁴⁸¹ dānaṃ parityajati |

§14h; folio 43r6–v3 (Cz 42.20–43.7; P 185.14–18)

api tu khalu punaḥ⁴⁸² subhūte ye⁴⁸³ kulaputrā⁴⁸⁴ vā kuladuhita¹ro vā imaṃ dharmaparyāyam udgrahiṣyaṃti | dhāra(yi)ṣyaṃti | vāc(a)yiṣyaṃti <|> paryavāpsyāṃti⁴⁸⁵ | jñā²v2tās te subhūte⁴⁸⁶ tathāgatena⁴⁸⁷ drṣṭās te subhūte⁴⁸⁸ tathāgatena⁴⁸⁹ buddhās te tathāgatena <|> sarve v3 te⁴⁹⁰ satvāḥ aprameyaṃ⁴⁹¹ puṇyaskandhaṃ prasaviṣyaṃti⁴⁹² |

§15a; folio 43v3–44r5 (Cz 43.8–19; P 185.18–186.4)

yaś ca khalu⁴⁹³ punaḥ subhūte strī v4 vā puruṣo vā pūrvāḥṇakālasamaye⁴⁹⁴ gaṃgānadīvālukupamān⁴⁹⁵ ātmabhāvān {} parityajet⁴⁹⁶ | madhyāḥṇakālasamaye⁴⁹⁷ sāyāḥṇakālasamaye⁴⁹⁸ gaṃgānadīvālukupamān⁴⁹⁹ āv6tmabhāvā<n> parityajet⁵⁰⁰ | anena paryāyeṇa⁵⁰¹ kalpakotīnayutaśa<ta>sahasrāṇy⁵⁰² ātma-

⁴⁶⁸ P omits: *khalu punaḥ*.

⁴⁶⁹ P: *yathā* for *yaḥ*.

⁴⁷⁰ M, Cz: *deśito nidhyāto* for *deśito vā*. P omits: *deśito vā*.

⁴⁷¹ P omits: *api nāma*.

⁴⁷² P omits: *puruṣo*.

⁴⁷³ M, Cz add: *na kiṃcid api paśyet*. M, Cz also read: *puruṣo 'mdhakārapraviṣṭo*; P: *(a)ndhakārapraviṣṭaḥ*.

⁴⁷⁴ S reads: *draṣṭavya*; P: *vaktavyaḥ* for *draṣṭavyo*.

⁴⁷⁵ M, Cz, P: *°patito*.

⁴⁷⁶ P omits: *api nāma*.

⁴⁷⁷ P: *puruṣo ca(kṣuṣm)ām* for *cakṣuṣmān puruṣo*.

⁴⁷⁸ M, Cz: *prabhātāyām rātrau*; P (partly reconstructed): *(pra)bhātāyām* for *vibhātāyām rātryām*.

⁴⁷⁹ P: *nānāvividhāni*.

⁴⁸⁰ M, Cz add: *avastupatito*.

⁴⁸¹ M, Cz: *yo 'vastupatito*; P (partly reconstructed): *(yo avastu)patito* for *yo vastvapatitaṃ*.

⁴⁸² P (reconstructed) omits: *khalu punaḥ*.

⁴⁸³ P adds: *te* after *ye*.

⁴⁸⁴ S reads: *kulaputro*.

⁴⁸⁵ M, Cz add: *parebhyaś ca vistareṇa samprakāśayiṣyaṃti*.

⁴⁸⁶ P omits: *subhūte*.

⁴⁸⁷ M, Cz add: *buddhajñānena*.

⁴⁸⁸ P omits: *subhūte*.

⁴⁸⁹ M, Cz add: *buddhacakṣuṣā*.

⁴⁹⁰ M, Cz add: *subhūte*.

⁴⁹¹ M, Cz add: *asaṃkhyeyaṃ* (Cz: *asaṃkhyeyaṃ*, corrected p. 116) after *aprimeyam*.

⁴⁹² M, Cz add: *pratigrahiṣyaṃti*.

⁴⁹³ P: *(yo) 'yaṃ ca ho* for *yaś ca khalu*.

⁴⁹⁴ P: *pūrvāḥṇasamaye* for *pūrvāḥṇakālasamaye*.

⁴⁹⁵ M, Cz: *°vālukāsamān*; P (reconstructed): *(°vālikāsamān)* for *°vālukupamān* (but M notes that Ch and T read *°vālukupamān*).

⁴⁹⁶ P: *(ā)tmabhāvaṃ parityāgāṃ pa(ritya)je* for *ātmabhāvān parityajet*. M, Cz add: *evaṃ* after *parityajet*.

⁴⁹⁷ P: *madhyāḥṇasamaye* for *madhyāḥṇakālasamaye*; M, Cz add: *gaṃgānadīvālukāsamān ātmabhāvān parityajet*.

⁴⁹⁸ P: *sāyāḥṇasamaye* for *sāyāḥṇakālasamaye*.

⁴⁹⁹ M, Cz: *°vālukāsamān*; P: *°vālikāsamān* for *°vālukupamān*.

bhā^{44r1}vān⁵⁰³ {|} parityajet |⁵⁰⁴ {d}yaś cemam⁵⁰⁵ dharmaparyāyam śrutvā | r2 na pratikṣiped ayam eva tatonidānam⁵⁰⁶ bahutaram puṇyaskandham prar³sunuyāt⁵⁰⁷ | aprameyam asaṃkhyeyam⁵⁰⁸ | kaḥ punar vādaḥ⁵⁰⁹ yo lir⁴khitvodgrhṇ(i)yāt⁵¹⁰ | dhārayet⁵¹¹ | vācayet⁵¹² | paryavāpnur⁵yāt⁵¹³ | parebhyaś⁵¹⁴ ca vistareṇa samprakāśayet⁵¹⁵ |

§15b; folio 44r5–45r4 (Cz 43.19–44.13; G 7a1–2; P 186.5–17)

api tu⁵¹⁶ subhūte acimtyo 'tur⁶lyo 'ya<m> dharmaparyāyah <|> ayam ca⁵¹⁷ dharmaparyāyah tathāgatena bhāṣitaḥ v1 agrayānasamprasthitānām satvānā(m a)r(th)āya | śreṣṭhayanāsamprasthitānām satvāv²nām arthāya | {ya} ye i<mam> dharmaparyāyam udgrahīṣyamti⁵¹⁸ | dhārayiṣyamti |⁵¹⁹ vāv³cayīṣya<m>ti⁵²⁰ <|> paryavāpsyamti⁵²¹ | jñātās te subhūte⁵²² tathāgate{ta} v4na⁵²³ dṛṣṭās te subhūte⁵²⁴ tathāgatena⁵²⁵ <|> sarve te⁵²⁶ satvāḥ v5 aprameyeṇa puṇyaskandhena⁵²⁷ samanvāgatā bhaviṣyamti | acimtyenātulyenāv⁶māpyenāparimāṇena⁵²⁸ puṇyaskandhena samanvāga^{45r1}tā bhaviṣyamti |⁵²⁹ tat kasya heto<h> | na hi ś(a)ky(aṃ) subhūte ayam⁵³⁰ dharmo⁵³¹ hīnādhimu(kt)i(k)aiḥ⁵³² r2 śrotum |

⁵⁰⁰ P: *ātmabhāvaṃ parityāgāṃ parityajet* for *ātmabhāvān parityajet*.

⁵⁰¹ M, Cz add: *bahūni*. There is insufficient space for *bahūni* in P.

⁵⁰² M, Cz: °*koṭīniyuta*° for °*koṭīnayuta*°. P: °*ko(t)īśatasāhasram* for °*koṭīnayutaśatasahasrāṇy*.

⁵⁰³ S reads: °*bhāvan*.

⁵⁰⁴ P: *ātmabhāvaparityāgāṃ parityajet*.

⁵⁰⁵ Frag b begins at this point.

⁵⁰⁶ P (reconstructed) omits: *tatonidānam* (missing in Frag b).

⁵⁰⁷ P: *prasaveta* for *prasunuyāt* (missing in Frag b).

⁵⁰⁸ P omits: *aprimeyam asaṃkhyeyam* (missing in Frag b).

⁵⁰⁹ P inserts: *subhūte* (but reading before it is unclear; missing in Frag b).

⁵¹⁰ Frag f begins at this point, with -yā.

⁵¹¹ P, Frag f: *dhāraye* (missing in Frag b).

⁵¹² P, Frag f: *vācaye* (missing in Frag b).

⁵¹³ Frag f: *paryavāpnuyā*. Pargiter reconstructs: *paryavāpnu(yāt)*, but *paryavāpnuyā* is the likely reading of P.

⁵¹⁴ P (reconstructed): *parasya* for *parebhyaś* (but see Pargiter p. 186, n. 3); Frag b: (*par*)eṣām; Frag f: *pareṣāñ*.

⁵¹⁵ P: (*samprakāśaye*; Frag f: *samprakāśaye* (missing in Frag b).

⁵¹⁶ M, Cz add: *khalu punaḥ* (missing in Frag b).

⁵¹⁷ M, Cz add: *subhūte* (missing in Frag b).

⁵¹⁸ P, Frag f: *udgrahēṣyanti* (missing in Frag b).

⁵¹⁹ P, Frag b, Frag f add: *deśayiṣyanti*.

⁵²⁰ Frag f: *vācayiṣyati*.

⁵²¹ S reads: *paryavāpsyamti*. Frag b: *paryāpa///*; Frag f: *paryavāpsyati*; M, Cz add: *parebhyaś ca vistareṇa samprakāśayiṣyamti*.

⁵²² P, Frag f omit: *subhūte* (missing in Frag b).

⁵²³ M, Cz add: *buddhajñānena* (missing in Frag b).

⁵²⁴ P, Frag f omit: *subhūte* (missing in Frag b).

⁵²⁵ M, Cz add: *buddhacakṣuṣā buddhās te tathāgatena* (missing in Frag b).

⁵²⁶ M, Cz add: *subhūte* (missing in Frag b).

⁵²⁷ P: *satvā prame(yena) puṇyaskandhena* (Pargiter reconstructs *prame(ya)puṇya*°, but there is too much space) ; Frag f: *satvā prameyena puṇya[si!]*skandhena** (missing in Frag b). In both cases read *satvāprameyena* (double sandhi) or *satvā 'prameyena*?

⁵²⁸ P (partly reconstructed): / *aprimeyeṇa* / (*amāpyena*); Frag f: *aprimeyenāpramāṇena* for °*amāpyenāparimāṇena*. G resumes at fol. 7r1 with *rimāṇena* (missing in Frag b).

⁵²⁹ G omits: *puṇyaskandhena samanvāgatā bhaviṣyamti*. After this sentence M, Cz, G, P, Frag f add: *sarve te subhūte* (G, P, Frag f omit: *subhūte*) *sattvāḥ* (G, Frag f: *satvā*; P: *satvāḥ*) *samāmsena* (G: *mamāmsena*; Frag f: *mama a(m)sena*; P: ++*yena*) *bodhiṃ* (Frag f: *bodhi*) *dhārayiṣyamti*, to which M further adds: *vācayiṣyamti paryavāpsyamti* (missing in Frag b). Cf. Tib., which adds: *sems can de dag thams cad na'i byañ chub phrag pa la thogs par 'gyur ro*.

⁵³⁰ Frag f: *mayam* (scribal error?).

nātmadr̥ṣṭikāiḥ na satvadr̥ṣṭikāiḥ na jīvadr̥ṣṭikāiḥ na pudgaladr̥ṣṭikāiḥ⁵³³ śar3kyam śrotum udgrahītum⁵³⁴ vā dhārayitum vā vācayitum vā⁵³⁵ paryavāptu(m)⁵³⁶ vā nedam sthānam vir4dyate <|>

§15c; folio 45r4–v2 (Cz 44.13–18; G 7a2–3; P 186.17–20)

api tu⁵³⁷ subhūte yatra pr̥thivīpradeśe idam sūtram⁵³⁸ prakāśayiṣyati⁵³⁹ | pūjar5nīyaḥ sa pr̥thivīpradeśo bhaviṣya(ti | sa)devamānuṣāsurasya⁵⁴⁰ lokasya vandav1nīyaḥ pradakṣiṇīkaraṇīyaś⁵⁴¹ ca sa pr̥thivīpradeśo bhaviṣyati⁵⁴² | cai(t)y(a)⁵⁴³ sa pr̥thiv2vīpradeśo bhaviṣyati |

§16a; folio 45v2–46r1 (Cz 44.18–45.6; G 7a3–5; P 186.20–187.3)

⁵⁴⁴ye te subhūte kulaputrā⁵⁴⁵ vā kuladuhitaro vā imān evamrūv3pām⁵⁴⁶ sūtrāmtān udgrahīṣyamti dhārayiṣyamti⁵⁴⁷ paryavāpsyamti⁵⁴⁸ | te paribhūtā bhaviṣyam<ti> v4 superibhūtāś ca bhaviṣyamti | ||⁵⁴⁹ yāni⁵⁵⁰ teṣām⁵⁵¹ satvānām paurvajānmikāni⁵⁵² karmāṇi kṛtāny⁵⁵³ av5pāyasamvartaniyāni⁵⁵⁴ dr̥ṣṭa eva dharme⁵⁵⁵ paribhūtatayā⁵⁵⁶ pūrvajānmik(āny⁵⁵⁷ aśubhān)i 46r1 karmāṇi⁵⁵⁸ kṣapayiṣya<m>ti |

⁵³¹ M, Cz, G, Frag f: *dharmaparyāyo*. P reads with S (missing in Frag b).

⁵³² M, Cz, G add: *sattvaiḥ* (missing in Frag b). Frag f reads with S.

⁵³³ G: *satvajīvapudgaladr̥ṣṭikāiḥ* for *satvadr̥ṣṭikāiḥ na jīvadr̥ṣṭikāiḥ na pudgaladr̥ṣṭikāiḥ* (missing in Frag b). Frag f reads °*dr̥ṣṭikai* in all cases.

⁵³⁴ M, Cz: *nābodhisattvapratijñaiḥ sattvaiḥ śakyam ayaṃ dharmaparyāyaḥ śrotum vodgrahītum* for *śakyam śrotum udgrahītum* (missing in Frag b). Frag f: *udgrahetum*.

⁵³⁵ G: *yāvat for dhārayitum vā vācayitum vā*. Frag b: */// rayitum vā | deśayitum ///*. Frag f also has *deśayitum vā* after *dhārayitum vā* and before *vācayitum*.

⁵³⁶ Frag f appears to have read: *paryāpunitum* for *paryavāptum*.

⁵³⁷ M, Cz, G add: *khalu punaḥ* (missing in Frag b).

⁵³⁸ P: *ayaṃ sūtrānto*; Frag f *ayaṃ sūtrānta* for *idam sūtram* (missing in Frag b).

⁵³⁹ M, Cz: *prakāśayiṣyate*; P, Frag f: *prakāśiṣyate* for *prakāśayiṣyati*. G reads with S. Frag b: */// .yate* (Matsuda reads *.yane*).

⁵⁴⁰ P: *sadevamanuṣyāsurasya* (missing in Frag b). Both P, G and Frag f punctuate before *sadeva*°. Frag f breaks off here, with *sadevamānuṣyāsu*.

⁵⁴¹ S reads: *pradakṣiṇīkadhaṇīyaś*. M, Cz: *pradakṣiṇīyaś* (missing in Frag b).

⁵⁴² G omits: *ca sa pr̥thivīpradeśo bhaviṣyati*.

⁵⁴³ M, Cz: *caityabhūtaḥ*; G: *caityabhūta*. P reads *caitya* with S (note that there is not enough space in S for a visarga). Frag b also reads with S.

⁵⁴⁴ M, Cz insert: *api tu*. Frag b reads with S.

⁵⁴⁵ S reads: *kulaputro* (all others: *kulaputrā*) (missing in Frag b).

⁵⁴⁶ S reads: *ivamrūpām*. M, Cz, G: *evamrūpān*; P: *evamrūpa*° (missing in Frag b).

⁵⁴⁷ M, Cz insert: *vācayiṣyamti* (missing in Frag b).

⁵⁴⁸ M, Cz add: *yoniśaś ca manasikariṣyamti parebhyāś ca vistareṇa samprakāśayiṣyamti*; G: *udgrahīṣyanti yāvat paryavāpsyanti*, P: *ugraheṣyati dhārayiṣyati deśayiṣyati vācayiṣyati paryavāpsyati* for *udgrahīṣyamti dhārayiṣyamti paryavāpsyamti*. Frag b: */// puniṣyanti* (Matsuda reads: *.uniṣ[ya]nti*), indicating the verb form *paryāpuniṣyanti* (cf. *paryāpunitum* found above in Frag f).

⁵⁴⁹ G omits: *ca bhaviṣyamti*. M, Cz add: *tat kasya hetoḥ* (missing in Frag b).

⁵⁵⁰ M, Cz, G insert: *ca* (missing in Frag b).

⁵⁵¹ M, Cz add: *subhūte* (missing in Frag b).

⁵⁵² S reads: *paurvā*°; G, P: *pūrvajānmikāni*; M, Cz, G insert: *aśubhāni*.

⁵⁵³ G omits: *kṛtāny* (missing in Frag b).

⁵⁵⁴ G, P add: *tāni* (missing in Frag b).

⁵⁵⁵ Cz adds: *tayā* (contra M).

⁵⁵⁶ M, Cz add: *tāni*.

⁵⁵⁷ M, Cz: *paurvajānmikāny*; Frag b: *pūrvabaj(a) ///*.

⁵⁵⁸ S reads: *karmāṇi*; G omits: *pūrvajānmikāny aśubhāni karmāṇi* (missing in Frag b).

buddhabodhiṃ ca prāpsyanti⁵⁵⁹ |⁵⁶⁰

§16b; folio 46r1–v4 (Cz 45.6–46.6; G 7a5–7b3; P 187.3–187.13)

⁵⁶¹abhijānāmy ahaṃ subhūte atite r2 'dhvani asaṃkhyeye kalpe asaṃkhyeyatare⁵⁶² dipaṃkarasya tathāgatasyārhatāḥ samyaksaṃr3buddhasya⁵⁶³ pareṇa parataraṃ⁵⁶⁴ caturaśītibuddhakoṭīnayutaśata-sahasrāṇy⁵⁶⁵ abhūr4van⁵⁶⁶ ye⁵⁶⁷ mayā ārādhitā ārādhayetvā na virādhitā⁵⁶⁸ <|> yac ca⁵⁶⁹ mayā subhūte⁵⁷⁰ buddhā bhagar5vaṃtaḥ ārāgitā⁵⁷¹ ārāgayetvā⁵⁷² na virāgitā⁵⁷³ yac ca⁵⁷⁴ carime kāle paścimi(k)āyaṃ⁵⁷⁵ paṃcā(śa)r6tyāṃ vartamānāyāṃ⁵⁷⁶ imaṃ s(ū)trāṃtam⁵⁷⁷ (u)d(gra)hīṣ(ya)ṃti⁵⁷⁸ dhāra(y)i(śya)ṃ(t)i v(āca)yi(śya)ṃ(t)i (pa)v1ryavāpsyanti⁵⁷⁹ | asya⁵⁸⁰ subhūt(e) puṇyaska(n)dh(a)sy(āṃ)t(i)k(ā)d⁵⁸¹ (e)ṣa⁵⁸² pū(r)v(a)k(aḥ⁵⁸³ puṇyaskandhaḥ śatatamī)v2m⁵⁸⁴ api kalā<m> nopaiti sāhasṛtamām⁵⁸⁵ api | śatasāha<sr>tamām⁵⁸⁶ a(p)i | k(o)t(īśatasāha)v3sṛtamām api⁵⁸⁷ | saṃkhyāṃ api kalām api gaṇanām

⁵⁵⁹ M, Cz, G: *anuprāpsyanti* (missing in Frag b). Lacuna in P, which may be filled by *kṣapayīṣyanti* / *buddhabodhiṃ cānuprāpsyanti* or perhaps even *kṣapayīṣyanti anuttarāṃ samyaksaṃbodhiṃ ca prāpsyanti*, as suggested by some of the Chinese translations (Kumārajīva, Bodhiruci, Paramārtha). Cf. Pargiter, p. 187, n. 1.

⁵⁶⁰ Note that §16a is quoted in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (ed. Bendall, p. 171): *yathā vajracchedikāyāṃ uktam | ye te subhūte kulaputrā vā kuladuhitaro vā imān evaṃrūpān sūtrāntān udgrahīṣyanti yāvat paryavāpsyanti | te paribhūtā bhaviṣyanti suparibhūtāḥ | tat kasya hetoḥ | yāni teṣāṃ satvānāṃ paurvajānmikāni karmāṇi kṛtāny apāyasamvartanīyāni | tāni tayā paribhūtatayā drṣṭa eva dharme kṣapayīṣyanti buddhabodhiṃ ca prāpsyantīti |*

⁵⁶¹ Cz inserts: *tat kasya hetoḥ* (contra M, which notes that Ch and T have this as well) (missing in Frag b).

⁵⁶² M, Cz, P, G: *asaṃkhyeyaiḥ kalpair* (P: *kalpaiḥ*) *asaṃkhyeyatarair* for *asaṃkhyeye kalpe asaṃkhyeyatare*. Frag b: *.ā + + saṃkhyeyatarai(r)*.

⁵⁶³ Lacuna in P. Pargiter's reconstruction omits: *arhataḥ*.

⁵⁶⁴ M, Cz: *paratarena*; G, P (reconstructed) omit *parataraṃ*.

⁵⁶⁵ M, Cz, P: *caturaśītibuddhakoṭīniyuta°*; P (partly reconstructed): *(caturaśīti)buddhakoṭīniyuta°*; G: *caturaśītir buddhakoṭīniyuta°*.

⁵⁶⁶ P: *babhūva*.

⁵⁶⁷ G: *yāni*.

⁵⁶⁸ M, Cz: *ārāgitā ārāgya* (Cz: *ārāgyā*) *na virāgitāḥ* (but M notes that J has *ārādhitā ārādhya na virāgitāḥ*); G: *ārāgitāni ārāgya ca na virāgitāni*; P: *ārādhitā* for *ārādhitā ārādhayetvā na virādhitā*.

⁵⁶⁹ P: *yaṃ ca*.

⁵⁷⁰ M, Cz, G add: *te*. Lacuna in P, between *subhū* and *virādhitā*. Frag b breaks off after *ā su*.

⁵⁷¹ G omits: *ārāgitā*.

⁵⁷² M, G: *ārāgya*; Cz (in error): *ārāgyā*.

⁵⁷³ P: *virādhitā*.

⁵⁷⁴ P: *yaṃ ca*.

⁵⁷⁵ *S paścimekāyaṃ*. Cf. *paścimaka*, BHSD, p. 338.

⁵⁷⁶ M, Cz: *paścime kāle paścime samaye paścimāyāṃ paṃcāśatyāṃ saddharmavipralopakāle vartamāna*; G: *carime kāle paścimāyāṃ paṃcāśatyāṃ varitamānāyāṃ*; P: *carimikāyāṃ paścimikāyā vartamānāyāṃ* for *carime kāle paścimikāyāṃ paṃcāśatyāṃ vartamānāyāṃ*.

⁵⁷⁷ M, Cz: *imān evaṃrūpān sūtrāntān*; G: *imāṃ sūtrāntān* for *imaṃ sūtrāṃtam*. P reads with S.

⁵⁷⁸ P: *udgraheṣyanti*.

⁵⁷⁹ M, Cz add: *parebhyaś ca vistareṇa samprakāśayiṣyanti*; G: *udgrahīṣyanti yāvat paryavāpsyanti* for *udgrahīṣyanti dhārayiṣyanti vācayiṣyanti paryavāpsyanti*.

⁵⁸⁰ M, Cz add: *khalu punaḥ*.

⁵⁸¹ G omits: *amṭikād*.

⁵⁸² What can be seen of the bottoms of the akṣaras supports this restoration, which is the reading of P. M, Cz, G: *asau* for *eṣa*.

⁵⁸³ M, Cz: *paurvakaḥ*.

⁵⁸⁴ P: *śatimām* for *śatatamīm*.

⁵⁸⁵ M, Cz, G: *sahasratamīm* (Cz: *sahasratamīm*, corrected p. 117); P: *sahasrimām*.

⁵⁸⁶ M, Cz, G: *śatasahasratamīm*; P: *śatasahasritamām*.

⁵⁸⁷ Although it is tempting to restore *koṭīnayuta°* on the basis of the same form at 43v6 and 46r3, there is not enough

api⁵⁸⁸ upamām api⁵⁸⁹ (u)v4paniśām api⁵⁹⁰ na kṣamate |

§16c; folio 46v4–6 (Cz 46.6–11; G 7b3–4; P 187.13–14)

(sace)t⁵⁹¹ subhūte teṣām kulaputrāṇām kuladuhi(t)ṛ(ṇām) v5 vā⁵⁹² puṇyaskandhaṃ bhāṣet⁵⁹³ |
yāva(m)taḥ⁵⁹⁴ te⁵⁹⁵ kula(p)utrā⁵⁹⁶ vā⁵⁹⁷ kuladuhitaro⁵⁹⁸ vā⁵⁹⁹ tasmin samaye (pu)v6ṇyaskandha<m>
pratigrhṇanti⁶⁰⁰ | unm(ā)d(a)m te⁶⁰¹ satvāḥ prāpnuyuḥ⁶⁰² cittavikṣepaṃ vā gacche(yuḥ |)

space for *nayuta*; S thus appears to have read with P here. M, Cz: *koṭitamīm api koṭīśatatamīm api koṭīśatasahasratamīm api koṭīniyutaśatasahasratamīm api*; P: *koṭīśatasahasritamām api* for *koṭīnayutaśatasāhasrtamām api*. G omits: *koṭīnayutaśatasāhasrtamām api*.

⁵⁸⁸ S reads: *apa*.

⁵⁸⁹ P omits: *upamām api*.

⁵⁹⁰ S reads: *upaniśamate*. M, Cz: *upaniśadam api yāvad aupamyam api*; P: *upaniśadam api* for *upaniśām api*. G reads with S.

⁵⁹¹ P: *sace*; M, Cz: *sacet punaḥ*.

⁵⁹² S reads: *tā*. M, Cz: *vāhaṃ*. G: *ca* for *vā*. P reads with S.

⁵⁹³ M, Cz, G: *bhāṣeyaṃ*. P reads with S.

⁵⁹⁴ M, Cz, P: *yāvat*; G: *yāvantaḥ* with S, which clearly reads *yavataḥ*, directly above which a fragment of the top layer of bark has lifted off, which may have carried the *anusvāra* over the *va*.

⁵⁹⁵ G adds: *satvā* after *te*.

⁵⁹⁶ P breaks off at *kulapu*. The next folio (fol. 12) is missing.

⁵⁹⁷ G omits: *vā*.

⁵⁹⁸ S reads: *kuladuhitā*. Corrected to *kuladuhitaro* with M, Cz.

⁵⁹⁹ G: *kuladuhitaraś ca* for *kuladuhitaro vā*.

⁶⁰⁰ M, Cz: *prasaviṣyaṃti pratigrahīṣyaṃti*; G: *parigrahīṣyanti* for *pratigrhṇanti*.

⁶⁰¹ M, Cz, G omit: *te*.

⁶⁰² M, Cz, G: *anuprāpnuyuḥ* for *prāpnuyuḥ*.